THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Studies in Sacred Theology
Second Series No. 164

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE LITERARY FORM, HAGGADIC MIDRASH, IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND INTERTESTAMENTAL LITERATURE

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the
School of Sacred Theology
Of The Catholic University of America
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree
Doctor of Sacred Theology

By

Addison G. Wright, S.S., M.A., S.T.L., S.S.L.

Washington, D. C.
1965

Nihil Obstat:

Reverend Roland E. Murphy, O.Carm.
Censor Deputatus

Imprimatur:

✝Patrick A. O'Boyle
Archbishop of Washington

December 21, 1964

Copyright by

Addison G. Wright, S.S.

1965

This dissertation was conducted under the direction of Reverend Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm., S.T.D., Professor of Sacred Scripture, as major professor and was approved by the Right Reverend Patrick W. Skehan, S.T.D., Professor of Semitic Languages, and Reverend John Quinlan, S.T.D., Assistant Professor of Sacred Scripture, as readers.

PREFACE

The writer wishes to take this occasion to express his gratitude to the Very Reverend Lloyd P. McDonald, S.S., Provincial of the Sulpicians in the United States, for the opportunity granted him to pursue graduate studies at The Catholic University of America. He is likewise grateful to Monsignor Patrick Wm. Skehan, who directed the writer's initial investigations, and to the Reverend Roland E. Murphy, O.Carm., under whose direction the doctoral dissertation was written, for their kind interest and helpful guidance. The author is indebted also to Monsignor Skehan and to the Reverend John Quinlan for their reading of the completed manuscript and their valuable suggestions and corrections.

December 1964

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
PREFACE		iii
INTRODUCTION		1
Chapter		
I.	THE ANCIENT AND MODERN USAGE OF THE TERM MIDRASH	23
	Etymology of the Root drš	23
	Dāraš in the Old Testament	27
	Midrāš in the Old Testament	35
	Dāraš in the Dead Sea Scrolls	47
	Midrāš in the Dead Sea Scrolls	60
	Drš and Mdrš in the Rabbinic Literature	75
	Modern Usage of the Term Midrash	80
	Conclusions	81
II.	THE PRIMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF HAGGADIC MIDRASH IN THE RABBINIC MIDRASHIM	85
	Historical Background of the Midrashim	85
	Structure of the Haggadic Midrashim	91
	Biblical Interpretation in the Midrashim	103
	A. Exegetical Methods	104
	B. The Nature of the Exegesis	132
	Conclusion: The Primary Characteristics of Haggadic Midrash	143
III.	THE SEARCH FOR HAGGADIC MIDRASH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND INTERTESTAMENTAL LITERATURE	157
	The Pesharim	158
	The Midrash of the Passover Haggadah	165
	The Palestinian Targums	169
	Narrative Midrash	169
	A. The Genesis Apocryphon	170
	B. Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum	175
	Non-Midrashic Narratives	175
	A. Josephus' Antiquities	176
	B. Chronicles	180
	C. Historical Psalms	186

Page

D. Sirach's Praise of the Fathers 187
E. Esther, Tobit, Jonah 190
The Homily of Wisdom 11-19 194
Redaction and Glosses 205
Isolated Midrashic Sections (Based on Explicit Citations) 209
Isolated Midrashic Sections (Based on Implicit Citations) 221
Anthological Style 224
Related Literary Forms 249
A. History 250
B. Apocalyptic 251
C. "Mashal" 258

SUMMARY 266

BIBLIOGRAPHY 269

INTRODUCTION

> It is absolutely necessary for the interpreter to go back in spirit to those remote centuries of the East, making proper use of the help afforded by history, archaeology, ethnology, and other sciences, in order to discover what literary forms the writers of that early age intended to use and did in fact employ. For the ancient people of the East, in order to express their ideas, did not always employ those literary forms which we use today, but rather those used by the men of their times and countries. What those were exactly the commentator cannot determine in advance, but only after a careful examination of the ancient literature of the East. . . . Hence the Catholic commentator . . . should make a prudent use of this means, i.e., determine to what extent the manner of expression or the literary form adopted by the sacred writer may lead to a correct and genuine interpretation; and let him be convinced that this part of his office cannot be neglected without serious detriment to Catholic exegesis.[1]

One of the predominant characteristics of Biblical studies during the past seventy-five years has been the careful and explicit attention given to the subject of literary forms. This trend has been made possible and stimulated by the vast amount of information on the Ancient Near East that we have come to possess during the past century and has resulted in many valuable studies of such genres as history, prophecy, apocalyptic, etc.

Within the past ten years in Christian Biblical circles there has been a growing interest in the literary genre of midrash in both Old and New Testament studies, and a large number of

---

[1]Pius XII, Divino Afflante Spiritu (Enchiridion Biblicum [Editio secunda aucta et recognita; Romae: Arnodo, 1954], nos. 558-560).

Biblical passages has been assigned to that category. Also the discoveries at Qumrân have raised the question of midrash as a possible designation for the Biblical commentaries found there. These recent discussions and the research necessitated by them have fortunately to some degree dispelled the ideas of Wellhausen lingering among Biblical scholars that midrash is a synonym for fable, and, what is more important, have focused attention on some of the primary characteristics of this genre. Moreover, among Catholics we see a considerable advance over the position taken by Lesètre in the Dictionnaire de la Bible in 1908 where the article on midrash is devoted mainly to the rabbinic commentaries on Scripture, and Biblical occurrences of midrash are limited to a few examples of OT exegesis in St. Paul.[1]

Unfortunately, however, as these recent studies have progressed, it has become more and more evident that there is little agreement among authors on what the literary form midrash really is. In the discussions on the Qumrân pesharim, for example, the primary characteristics of midrash have been variously given as: the literary structure of the rabbinic midrashim;[2] the seeking of hidden meanings in the Scriptures by rabbinic methods

---

[1]H. Lesètre, "Midrasch" Dictionnaire de la Bible, 4 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1908), cols. 1077-80.

[2]Millar Burrows as quoted in William H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," The Biblical Archaeologist, 14 (1951), 76.

of exegesis;[1] a development of a Biblical text (at least more than a paraphrase) and citations from other Biblical material;[2] interpretations derived essentially from the text (i.e., not coming from elsewhere and standing merely "neben dem text") and the rabbinic literary structure;[3] rabbinic method, structure, and aims.[4] In these Qumrân studies the tendency frequently has been to restrict the term midrash and to limit it more or less to its rabbinic forms.

In Biblical studies on the other hand the term midrash has been used in what appears to be a very extended sense. Renée Bloch in the article "Midrash" in the Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément has defined rabbinic midrash as a homiletic reflection or meditation on the Bible which seeks to reinterpret or actualize a given text of the past for present circumstances.[5] Then

---

[1]Brownlee, ibid.; Krister Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew (Uppsala: Gleerup, 1954), pp. 184-85, 189-94.

[2]Géza Vermes, "A propos des commentaires bibliques découverts à Qumrân," La Bible et l'Orient (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955), pp. 96-97. It is difficult to see how he could hold this position today since he subscribes to most of the views of Renée Bloch.

[3]Karl Elliger, Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953), pp. 163-64.

[4]Lou H. Silberman, "Unriddling the Riddle," Revue de Qumrân, 3 (1961), 323-35

[5]Renée Bloch, "Midrash," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, Fasc. 28 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1955), cols. 1265-66. Even for rabbinic midrash Bloch gives two definitions. In discussing the rabbinic use of the word midrash, she offers

in her discussion of the Biblical material her definition becomes much broader, and she classifies as midrash "ouvrages historiques qui glossent l'écriture dans un but d'instruction et d'édification" (the word midrash in Chr);[1] "une méditation sur l'histoire, tendant à donner à cette histoire une actualité qui réponde aux préoccupations de l'heure" (Chr);[2] "le réemploi des textes sacrés transmis, avec une réflexion religeuse sur leur contenu, sur le passé dont ils sont témoins, avec l'actualisation qui les rapporte ... à la situation présente" (Ez 16);[3] anthological style, "which is a reflection or meditation on prior texts that develops, enriches and transposes the earlier message" (Sir, Wis, Prv, 1QH, Lk 1-2, etc.);[4] "la référence constante aux données bibliques, la dramatisation et la réinterprétation des événements et des aspirations de l'époque" (Ct);[5] "l'utilisation des textes scripturaires dans un but d'édification, en fonction des besoins contemporains" (Sir 44,1-50,24);[6] a work which

---

another definition: "le terme midrash désigne une exégèse qui, dépassant le simple sens littéral, essaie de pénétrer dans l'esprit de l'Écriture, de scruter le texte plus profondément et d'en tirer des interprétations qui ne sont pas toujours immédiatement obvies" (cols. 1264-65).

[1] Ibid., col. 1264. [2] Ibid., col. 1271.

[3] Ibid., col. 1272; cf. also R. Bloch, "Ézéchiel XVI: example parfait du procécé midrashique dans la Bible," Cahiers Sioniens, 9 (1955), 193-223.

[4] Bloch, "Midrash," cols. 1270-71, 1273, 1279.

[5] Ibid., col. 1273. [6] Ibid., col. 1274.

alludes to earlier history and suppresses, embellishes and rearranges the traditional accounts and imposes a new sense on them (Wis 10-19);[1] a work with Scriptural reminiscences which proceeds entirely from a meditation on Scripture (Sir 24);[2] a development on OT texts (Mt 1-2).[3] Mlle. Bloch also distinguishes between "midrash properly speaking" which begins with the Targum of Jerusalem and "midrashic genre as such" which is already present in the Biblical literature,[4] but the terms are not explained nor is her use of them consistent.[5]

A number of exegetes have taken up one or another of the definitions of Mlle. Bloch and have enlarged upon her brief observations in the Dictionnaire, and many other writers have independently proposed examples of OT and NT midrash based on similar, and equally divergent, conceptions (midrash is the glossing of Sacred Scripture, the interpretation of texts, the interpretation of events or themes or persons, the presentation of data in

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., col. 1273.

[3] Ibid., col. 1279; although in "Quelques aspects de la figure de Moïse dans la tradition rabbinique," Cahiers Sioniens, 8 (1954), 283 she prefers to draw no conclusion on the literary form of Mt 1-2.

[4] Renée Bloch, "Note methodologique pour l'étude de la littérature rabbinique," Recherches de Science Religieuse, 43 (1955), 212.

[5] For example she calls the Canticle "un pur midrash" ("Midrash," col. 1273), Sir 44,1-50,24 "un midrash aggodique" (col. 1274), etc.

OT terms, embellished history).[1] Even the sources underlying the Gospels and the Gospels themselves have been seen as Christian

---

[1]E.g., Rene Laurentin, Structure et theologie de Luc I-II ("Études Bibliques"; Paris: Gabalda, 1957); A. Robert et A. Feuillet, Introduction à la Bible (Tournai: Desclée, 1957-59), 2 vols. passim; Robert T. Siebeneck, C.PP.S., "May Their Bones Return to Life!--Sirach's Praise of the Fathers," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 21 (1959), 411-28; id., "The Midrash of Wisdom 10-19," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 22 (1960), 176-82; S. Muñoz Iglesias, "El Genero literario del Evangelio de la Infancia en San Mateo," Estudios Bíblicos, 17 (1958), 243-73; Myles Bourke, The Literary Genus of Matthew 1-2," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 22 (1960), 160-75; David Stanley, S.J., The Gospel of St. Matthew (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1960), pp. 10, 13; J. W. Doeve, Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954); J. Bonsirven, S.J., "Genres litteraires dans la littérature juive postbiblique," Biblica, 35 (1954), 328-45; Jean Levie, S.J., La Bible, parole humaine et message de Dieu (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1958), pp. 256-57; Joseph Reider, The Book of Wisdom (New York: Harper, 1957), p. 40; E. Osty, p.s.s., Le Livre de la Sagesse ("Bible de Jérusalem"; 2d ed. rev.; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1957), pp. 19-22; Frederick C. Grant, Ancient Judaism and the New Testament (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1960), pp. 110-112; M. D. Goulder and W. L. Sanderson, "St. Luke's Genesis," Journal of Theological Studies, 8 (1957), 12-30; E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), p. 46; David Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London: Athalone Press, 1956), pp. 158-95; Guiu M. Camps, O.S.B., "Midraš sobre la Història de les Plagues," Miscellanea Biblica B. Ubach (Montserrat, 1953), pp. 97-113; Ernst Vogt, Textumdeutungen im Buch Ezechiel," Sacra Pagina (Paris: Gabalda, 1959), I, 471-94; Adolphe Lods, Histoire de la littérature hebraïque et juive (Paris: Payot, 1950); A. H. McNeile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Macmillan, 1952); p. 23; A. Feuillet, p.s.s., "Jonas," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, 4 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1949), cols. 1110, 1118-19; A. Brunet, "Paralipomènes," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, 6 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1960), cols. 1236-37; Donal Griffitts, O.F.M., "The Literary Genus of the Matthean Infancy Narrative," Priestly Studies, 29 (1962), 30-65; Charles Perrot, "La Lecture synagogale d'Exode xxi, 1-xxii, 23 et son influence sur la littérature neotestamentaire," A la rencontre de Dieu. Mémorial Albert Gelin (Le Puy: Editions Xavier Mappus, 1961), pp. 223-39; J. Edgar Bruns, "The Magi Episode in Matthew 2," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 23 (1961), 51-54; F. F. Bruce, "The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 43 (1961), 336-53; I. L. Seeligmann, "Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegese,"

midrashim (works made up of a series of OT texts each followed by its Christian explication),[1] and the redaction of OT texts has been suggested as the earliest example of midrash.[2] The result is that the word midrash at present is an equivocal term and is being used to describe a mass of disparate material. Indeed, if some of the definitions are correct, large amounts, if not the whole of the Bible, would have to be called midrash. Hence, as the word is used currently in Biblical studies it is approaching the point where it is no longer really meaningful and where some of the material designated as midrash resembles the later rabbinic midrash only in a very superficial way. And, surprisingly, very few voices have been raised in protest over this lack of precision in the definition of rabbinic and biblical

---

Congress Volume, Copenhagen ("Supplements to Vetus Testamentum"; vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 1953), pp. 150-81; Georges Auzou, The Word of God (St. Louis: Herder, 1960), pp. 39, 180, 198-99; R. E. Murphy, O. Carm., Seven Books of Wisdom (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1960), pp. 130-34; J. A. Fitzmyer, S.J., "'Now This Melchizedek . . .' (Heb 7,1)," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 25 (1963), 305-306; Peter F. Ellis, C.SS.R., The Men and the Message of the Old Testament (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1963), pp. 448-63, 515-29, 533-34.

[1]Doeve, op. cit.; id., "Le rôle de la tradition orale dans la composition des évangiles synoptiques," La Formation des évangiles, eds. J. Cambier et L. Cerfaux (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1957), pp. 70-84.

[2]Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (London: Black, 1952), pp. 309, 361, 368-73; Geza Vermes, Scripture and Tradition in Judaism (Leiden: Brill, 1961), pp. 127-77; Bloch, "Midrash," cols. 1273, 1275; Samuel Sandmel, "The Haggada Within Scripture," Journal of Biblical Literature, 80 (1961), 105-122; Camps, art. cit., p. 98.

midrash and over this extensive application of the term.[1]

To appreciate the reasons for this confusion over the definition of midrash, it might be useful at this point to review the course of modern midrashic studies.

Modern scientific studies of Jewish midrash began in the last century with the works of L. Zunz[2] and A. Geiger[3] who produced the first descriptive surveys and analyses of the midrashic and related literature. Another systematic study of the rabbinic material on a smaller scale was H. L. Strack's Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, five editions of which appeared between 1887 and 1920.[4] At the end of the century Wilhelm Bacher produced studies on the exegetical terminology of the Rabbis[5] and

---

[1]J. Coppens, "L'Évangile lucanien de l'enfance," Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses, 33 (1957), 733; C. Spicq, "Nouvelles reflexions sur la théologie biblique," Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques, 42 (1958), 218, n. 34; E. Galbiati, "Esegesi degli Evangeli festivi. L'Adorazione dei Magi (Matt. 2,1-12)," Bibbia e Oriente, 4 (1962), 26.

[2]L. Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden (Frankfurt: J. Kauffmann, 1832; 2nd ed., 1892).

[3]A. Geiger, Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwicklung des Judenthums (Breslau: Hainauer, 1857).

[4]Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch (5th ed.; München: Beck, 1920). An English translation which really is a sixth edition was published in 1931 (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society) and reprinted in 1959 (New York: Meridian Books).

[5]W. Bacher, Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur, 2 vols. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1899-1905).

also attempted a chronological stratification of the material in the Midrashim by grouping the interpretations therein according to the different Rabbis of the Tannaitic (30 B.C.-210 A.D.) and Amoraic (210-500 A.D.) periods to whom the sayings were ascribed.[1] In 1909 Louis Ginzberg published the first volume of a collection of various midrashic interpretations gathered from all the sources but arranged topically with no attention to chronological order.[2]

After the first World War several attempts to produce a synthesis of the results of this and other research appeared. Especially to be noted among them was George Foot Moore's Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era,[3] which was a presentation of "the religious conceptions and moral principles of Judaism . . . in the form in which, by the end of the second century of the Christian era, they attained general acceptance and authority."[4] J. Bonsirven produced a French counterpart to this study in Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ.[5]

---

[1]W. Bacher, Die Agada der Tannaiten, 2 vols. (Strassburg: Karl Trübner, 1884-90); Die Agada der babylonischen Amoräer (Strassburg: Karl Trübner, 1878); Die Agada der palästinensischen Amoräer, 3 vols. (Strassburg: Karl Trübner, 1892-99).

[2]Louis Ginzberg, Legends of the Jews, 7 vols. (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1909-1938).

[3]3 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-30).

[4]Ibid., I, 125.

[5]2 vols. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1935).

These early studies (to the varying degrees that each was concerned with midrash) were largely interested in content (the beliefs and exegetical interpretations contained in the Midrashim) and in dating (of Rabbis to whom the interpretations were ascribed and of redactions and editions of the Midrashim). Moreover the whole critical approach to midrashic studies of thirty years ago was constructed on the assumptions that (1) the Targums Onkelos and Jonathan represent Tannaitic interpretations of the Torah and the Prophets; they date from the second century A.D. and are preserved in a Babylonian recension of the third century and their midrashic elements are suspected of being later accretions. The Palestinian Targums, preserved in late recensions, are of little importance as witnesses of Tannaitic exegesis.[1] (2) Both halakic and haggadic midrash began in the period of the Sopherim (5th-3d cent. B.C.) and traces of them can be found in the Bible, Apocrypha, Josephus, Philo, etc. For haggadic exegesis, however, the period of great creativity was between 100-500 A.D. Of greatest interest therefore for haggadic midrash are the Midrashim dating (in their first recensions) from the Tannaitic and Amoriac periods. Much of the material in these works dates from those periods although some of the anonymous interpretations may be earlier.[2] (3) For dating of traditions we must rely on

---

[1]Moore, op. cit., I, 174-76.

[2]W. Bacher, "Bible Exegesis--Jewish," Jewish Encyclopedia, III (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1902), 162-64; J. Theodor, "Midrash Haggadah," Jewish Encyclopedia, VIII (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1904), 551.

the names of the Rabbis which in many cases are found transmitted along with the interpretations.[1]

Such were the general opinions on midrash when Moore wrote, but in the following years new studies, editions and discoveries modified or completely changed some of these basic assumptions and altered the course of haggadic studies especially.

Three years after the publication of Moore's Judaism, Salomo Rappaport in a detailed study[2] demonstrated that a large amount of haggadic material parallel to rabbinic haggadah is to be found in Josephus' Jewish Antiquities, and conjectured that Josephus did not invent it but followed well established traditions and borrowed many of the haggadic elements from an Aramaic Targum.[3]

In the same year Paul Kahle edited a large number of Geniza fragments of the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch[4] and concluded that the Palestinian Targum corresponds to a stratum of targumic tradition older than the Targum Onkelos.[5] Since

---

[1]Cf. the works of Bacher cited above on the Agada of the Tannaim and Amoraim. For the limitations inherent in this criterion cf. Bernard J. Bamberger, "The Dating of Haggadic Materials," Journal of Biblical Literature, 68 (1949), 115-23.

[2]Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus (Wien: Kohut, 1930).

[3]Ibid., pp. xx-xxiv.

[4]Masoreten des Westens, vol. 2 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930).

[5]Ibid., pp. 9-13.

then, other fragments of the Palestinian Targum have been published by A. Díez Macho;[1] and Professor Kahle has re-examined the problem and, with new evidence which confirms his previous estimate, proposes a pre-Christian date for the Palestinian Targum, including its midrashic elements.[2]

Also during the 1930's, André Robert pointed out in the postexilic scriptural writings the phenomenon which he called style anthologique and which he came to see as the earliest form of the midrashic genre[3]--thus opening up the whole topic of the Biblical origins of midrash, something casually mentioned in earlier midrashic studies but never energetically pursued.

In 1948 the discoveries in the Judean Desert were announced and since then have yielded material bearing on Jewish Biblical interpretation between the second century B.C. and the first century A.D. The resemblances in method and content between the exegesis of the Scrolls and that of the rabbinic writ-

---

[1] "Nuevos fragmentos del Targum palestinense," Sefarad, 15 (1955), 31-39; "Nuevos fragmentos de Tosefta Targumica," ibid., 16 (1956), 319-24.

[2] P. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza (London: Oxford University Press, 1947), pp. 122-23; 2d ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1959), pp. 191-208.

[3] E.g., A. Robert, "Les attaches littéraires bibliques de Prov. i-ix," Revue Biblique, 43 (1934), 42-68, 172-204, 374-84; 44 (1935), 344-65, 502-25; id., "Le genre littéraire du Cantique des cantiques," Vivre et Penser, 3d. series (1943-44), 192-213; id., "Littéraires (genres)," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, 5 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1957), cols. 411-17; id, "Les genres littéraires," Initiation Biblique, eds. A. Robert et A. Tricot (3d. ed. rev.; Paris: Desclée, 1954), pp. 305-309.

ings once again turned the attention of scholars to the question of pre-Tannaitic haggadah.

In 1949 G. Kisch republished for the first time since the sixteenth century the Latin text of Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum.[1] It had been studied by Cohn at the end of the last century[2] and subsequently translated into English[3] and German,[4] but the edition of Kisch served to call it to mind once again at this important time as a first century A.D. specimen of historical haggadah whose exegetical traditions are much older,[5] and whose interpretations coincide almost without exception with those found in the rabbinic haggadah.

Mention must finally be made of the discovery by A. Díez Macho in 1956 of a complete MS of the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch in the Codex Neofiti I of the Vatican Library.[6] It is

---

[1] Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1949).

[2] L. Cohn, "An Apocryphal Work Ascribed to Philo of Alexandria," Jewish Quarterly Review, Old Series, 10 (1898), 277-332.

[3] M. R. James, The Biblical Antiquities of Philo, Now First Translated from the Old Latin Version (New York: Macmillan, 1917).

[4] P. Riessler, Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel (Augsburg: Filser, 1928), pp. 735-861.

[5] A. Spiro, "Samaritans, Tobiads, and Judahites in Pseudo-Philo," Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, 20 (1951), 281, n. 11.

[6] A. Díez Macho, "Una copia de todo el Targum jerosolimitano en la Vaticana," Estudios Bíblicos, 15 (1956), 446-47; id., "The

closely related to the Geniza fragments of the Palestinian Targum, and when it is published, the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan, which certainly represents a secondary form of the Palestinian Targum, will no longer be the only source available for the study of passages not covered either by the Fragmentary Targum or the fragments from the Geniza.

From the progress outlined here it is seen that conditions of research into haggadic midrash have altered greatly. Important new theories and data include the Biblical origins of the midrashic process, the priority of the midrashic (Palestinian) Targum to the Targum translation, and the pre-Tannaitic origin of a great number of haggadic interpretations which figure in works such as the Dead Sea Scrolls, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, etc. In other words both the nature and the antiquity of haggadic midrash now appear in an entirely different perspective.

Consequently there has been the feeling that the moment is ripe for the elaboration of a new synthesis. Renée Bloch attempted such an undertaking but her tragic death in 1955 prevented her from doing much more than grapple with the preliminaries.[1]

Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum," Congress Volume, Oxford ("Supplements to Vetus Testamentum"; vol. 7; Leiden: Brill, 1960), pp. 222-45.

[1]Cf. "Écriture et tradition dans le judaïsme, apercus sur l'origine du midrash," Cahiers Sioniens, 8 (1954), 9-34; "Note méthodologique pour l'étude de la littérature rabbinique," Recherches de science religieuse, 43 (1955), 194-227; "Note sur l'utilisation des fragments de la Geniza du Caire pour l'étude du Targum palestinien," Revue des Études Juives, New Series 14

Two of her studies merit special attention: the article "Midrash" in the Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, and "Note méthodologique pour l'étude de la littérature rabbinique." The former gives a sketch of a new synthesis, and the latter provides rules for a comparative historical study.

In her work on the synthesis Mlle. Bloch first described the characteristics of rabbinic midrash and then investigated its Biblical origins in the postexilic books and traced the phenomenon down through the Intertestamental literature and the NT. The wholly novel element in this synthesis was the systematic effort to situate midrash within an historical perspective and indicate the states of its evolution in the Biblical and post-Biblical literature.

In this same connection R. Bloch demanded that in rabbinic midrash also we should distinguish the stages of the evolution of exegetical traditions and that the Midrashim should be studied according to the same principles of historical and literary criticism as is the Bible itself. The aim and method of such a study she set forth in her "Note méthodologique":

> Le problème est donc de déterminer, par un travail attentif de critique historique et surtout littéraire, et par une

---

(1955), 5-35; "Midrash," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, fasc 28 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1955), cols. 1263-1281; "Ézéchiel XVI: exemple parfait du procédé midrashique dans la Bible," Cahiers Sioniens, 9 (1955), 192-223; "Quelques aspects de la figure de Moïse dans la tradition rabbinique," Cahiers Sioniens, 8 (1954), 211-85; "Juda engéndera Pharès et Zarah de Thamar (Mt 1,3)," Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de Andre Robert (Paris: Bloud et Gay, n.d.), pp. 381-89.

> étude comparative, la cheminement et l'ancienneté respective des traditions, la formation, la situation historique et l'interdépendance des écrits rabbiniques.[1]

In order to date midrashic traditions, she proposed that in addition to the employment of historical and philological criteria, etc., analysis should also include external and internal comparison: external comparison consisting in confronting the undated traditions of rabbinic writings with non-rabbinic Jewish texts which are approximately dated; internal comparison being the following of the development of a tradition within the boundaries of rabbinic literature itself. The Palestinian Targum is of prime importance for such work because it reflects a very early stage of haggadic tradition.

P. Grelot,[2] R. Le Déaut[3] and G. Vermes[4] have attempted to test the feasibility and validity of Bloch's methods, and the latter has traced the development of a few rabbinic traditions from pre-Christian dates with the help of the LXX, the Palestinian

---

[1]Bloch, "Note méthodologique ... ," pp. 202-203.

[2]P. Grelot, "Une Tosephta targoumique sur Genèse xxii dans un manuscrit liturgique de la Geniza du Caire," Revue des Études Juives, New Series 16 (1957), pp. 19 and 21, n. 2; "Les Targums du Pentateuque--Étude comparative d'après Genèse iv, 3-16," Semitica, 9 (1959), 59-88; "Sagesse 10, 21 et le Targum de l'Exode," Biblica, 42 (1961), 49-60.

[3]R. Le Deaut, C.S.Sp., "Traditions targumiques dans le Corpus Paulinien?" Biblica, 42 (1961), 28-48; idem., La nuit pascale (Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1963).

[4]G. Vermes, Scripture and Tradition in Judaism (Leiden: Brill, 1961). The historical survey from Zuny to Bloch given above is taken from Vermes, pp. 1-10, with modifications.

Targum, the DSS, Josephus, Pseudo-Philo, etc. On the basis of his studies Vermes has concluded that the earliest traces of post-Biblical haggadah are probably to be found in explanatory glosses, corrections of the scribes and Qere-Ketib. The period of great creative activity began in the fourth or third century B.C. and relaxed only toward the end of the second century A.D. The bulk of the work was completed in the peaceful age of the Ptolemaic rule, as may be seen from the fact that in exegetical writings of the second century B.C. the main haggadic themes are already fully developed. From the second century A.D. on the tendency was toward elaboration, codification, and compilation, but there was scarcely any new creation. The most primitive structure of the haggadah is preserved in the Fragmentary Targum, the Geniza fragments of Targum Yerushalmi and Codex Neofiti. Here the reading in the synagogue of a certain section of the Torah was followed by a haggadic development relating to a particular verse of the Torah section but extended to include the whole passage. In another early haggadic form the haggadic unit covers the entire Torah section and is either split into shorter interpretations to expound the passage verse by verse as in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, or else its commentary is inserted into the completely rewritten Biblical narrative as in Jubilees, Genesis Apocryphon, Jewish Antiquities and Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 228-29.

These conclusions are exceedingly broad and very confidently given considering the small amount of material Vermes has investigated; but the trend in midrashic studies becomes clear--attention focused on the Biblical and Intertestamental period, and the placing of the creative period for haggadic midrash much earlier than had previously been done (although that the bulk of the work was completed as early as the Ptolemaic era in Palestine is hardly credible). The earlier interest in content has today developed into a more sophisticated discussion of the evolution of interpretations and theology; and earlier desires to date interpretations are now being fulfilled in a more satisfying way with many works antecedent to the Midrashim available for comparison. How many traditions will be able to be traced in their development from early times remains to be seen in the years that follow the publication of the Codex Neofiti I, for only then can the work begin in earnest, but many undoubtedly will be dated and perhaps enough ultimately to bear out the preliminary synthesis of Bloch and some of the conclusions which Vermes has rather prematurely proposed.

Interesting is the fact that throughout all of these studies there has been no real attempt carefully to define midrash. The earlier studies contained detailed descriptions of rabbinic midrash but little effort was made to sift primary characteristics from secondary features. Nor was there an imperative need to, since the studies were not concerned with midrash as a literary form and they were largely concerned with analyzing

a given body of literature rather than with finding other material like it. On the other hand Mlle. Bloch, in her large-scale attempts to go back into the pre-Tannaitic literature and point out earlier stages of midrash as a literary form, has realized the need of a more precise definition and has proposed certain basic features of midrash, but without supporting evidence and without carefully distinguishing the primary from the secondary characteristics in a consistent manner. For, as we have seen, before her study comes to a close her definition becomes very broad indeed, undoubtedly out of a laudable desire to show the organic bond between the Bible and the later rabbinic literature.

It is not surprising then that we find a variety of definitions of midrash in current Biblical and Intertestamental studies. For the Biblical or Intertestamental scholar, increasingly desirous of accurately classifying his literature according to literary forms, and alerted to the possibility of midrash in his material by the work of Bloch or by the same new theories and data that occasioned the work of Bloch, is left to draw upon a wide variety of definitions from midrashic studies in which definitions either are not the main point of interest or are not the strongest feature. And to compound the problem, there is the additional fact that, as always, the dividing line between one literary form and another can often be elusive, and this seems to be especially true in the case of midrash.

There is a real need then, for an investigation into midrash as a literary form for the purpose of delineating its

primary characteristics, constructing a definition in terms of them, and finding genuine pre-rabbinic examples. It is to this task that we have addressed ourselves in the following pages in the hope that we might offer some contribution to that area of midrashic studies which is of prime importance to the Biblical scholar and which has been so long neglected.

The subject matter is of course extensive. We possess examples of midrash dating from the origins of the genre in the postexilic age down to its demise in the thirteenth century of the Christian era--from its early forms in the later books of the OT to its fully developed form in the Midrashim. The literature comprises both legal (halakic) and nonlegal (haggadic) material each with its own characteristics. It has been necessary then to limit the dimensions of the study to a manageable size, and thus, first of all, we have chosen to confine ourselves to haggadic midrash. We do not mean thereby to imply that halakic midrash is essentially different from haggadic (for indeed much of what we say would be applicable to halakic as well) but the halakic does have its own secondary traits and to include a discussion of it would only lengthen the study without proportionate advantage since it is haggadic midrash which is of the greater interest to the Biblical scholar and concerning which there seems to be the most confusion. We have also restricted our search for pre-rabbinic midrash to the OT and the Intertestamental Literature. This offers a convenient limitation and at the same time a logical one since this material is the direct forerunner of the

rabbinic literature. Moreover, conclusions arrived at in this literature can readily be applied to other material.

In his study of apocalyptic Bruce Vawter remarks:

> However necessary, not to say indispensable, is our determination of literary forms and interpretation according to their canons, we have to recognize that the determination and specification are really ours rather than the ancient writers'. The ancient writer was not precisely conscious of writing in a "literary form," aside, of course, from such obvious genres as prose or poetry, part of the mechanics common to all literatures. His lack of conscious advertence makes the literary forms no less definable and applicable, but it should also remind us that his own appreciation of his work ought to be consulted in forming the definition. What the writer was aware of was that he wrote within a particular tradition: it is this that largely decided the literary form to which we have given a name. He was a Deuteronomist, a priestly writer, a follower of the sages, an anthologist of the prophets, or the like.
>
> In 1,1 the author of Ap applies the term apokalypsis to his work. It is apparent that the term is used by him in no technical way, but not only have we made it the title of his book, we have extended it to a broad body of mainly Jewish literature with which his book shares some striking characteristics. . . .[1]

These remarks are applicable, mutatis mutandis, to most of the Biblical literary forms, and they indicate four areas of investigation for the study of a literary genre: (1) the history of the name of the genre in its technical and non-technical usages; (2) the establishing of the exemplar of the literary form (the work or works which by convention possess an undisputed claim to the label); (3) the notes or characteristics constitutive of the form (primary) and the ones that are incidental or acquired in the process of development (secondary); (4) the verification of the

---

[1]Bruce Vawter, C.M., "Apocalyptic: Its Relation to Prophecy," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 22 (1960), 33.

primary characteristics in literature other than the exemplar and the consequent building up of the classification.

In Chapter One of our investigation of the literary form midrash we have discussed areas 1 and 2. We have set forth the ancient and modern usage of the word midrash to point out its various meanings past and present, and to establish the corpus of literature that is regarded as the exemplar.

In Chapter Two we have discussed the characteristics of haggadic midrash as found in the exemplar, the midrashim of the 2nd to 13th cent. A.D., and have attempted to sift the primary characteristics from the secondary (area 3).

In Chapter Three we have attempted, on the basis of the conclusions of Chapter Two to isolate earlier examples of haggadic midrash in the Old Testament and Intertestamental Literature (area 4)--the primary aim of our endeavor. In this chapter we have also considered the current concepts of midrash mentioned above and have evaluated them according to our findings.

CHAPTER I

THE ANCIENT AND MODERN USAGE OF THE TERM MIDRASH

The word midrash has been in use for at least 2500 years. Its first extant occurrence is in the second book of Chronicles and it is still being employed by Jews and Christians today. Words frequently change their connotation in the course of time; they acquire new meanings, lose old meanings, become technical terms, etc. Unfortunately, some of the imprecision in the current use of the word midrash has been due to a failure to distinguish between the various historical uses of the word and to a tendency to use univocally what is in fact an historically equivocal term. It will be useful, then, at the outset to discuss the various historical uses of the noun midrash and, in the case of the ancient literature where our information is scanty and every clue is helpful, the verb dārăs as well. At the same time we shall see what light if any the word sheds on the nature of the literary form, and what body of literature is the exemplar.

Etymology of the Root drš

The etymology of the Hebrew root drš is not at all certain. In Akkadian the verb darāšu occurs once,[1] and this in a

---

[1]Wolfram von Soden suggests a second occurrence of darāšu in his reconstruction, (ad-)da-ri-iš, in "Ein Zweigespräch

bilingual text where it translates the Sumerian búr and has "wound" for its object.[1] The basic meaning of búr is "to open,"[2] and perhaps darāšu here conveys the meaning of "open, probe, investigate." However, this conclusion is quite conjectural. The same root also occurs in the noun durušš̆u (on the purussu pattern) which means "foundation" (apparently "the thing trodden on, trampled down"). Related to this, therefore, would seem to be the verb darāsu, "to tramp̆le, tread upon > rub out > reject, push aside." Perhaps an original š̆ is preserved in the noun and is lost in the verb for some unknown reason, or perhaps an original s became a š̆ in the noun (by analogy with its synonyms uššu and išdu).

In Arabic (š̆ and s > s) the verb darasa means "to tread > to erase, wear smooth; to study"[3] (the last, a meaning borrowed

---

Hammurabis mit einer Frau," Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, 49 (1950), 164. However, Moshe Held, on the basis of clearer photographs than were available to von Soden, construes the sentence differently and apparently reconstructs (ana) da-ri-iš, "forever"; see "A Faithful Lover in an Old Babylonian Dialogue," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, 15 (1961), 6.

[1]For this and the other Akkadian occurrences, see Ignace J. Gelb et al. (eds.), The Assyrian Dictionary, III (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1959), 110, 198; Wolfram von Soden, Akkadisches Handwörterbuch (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1959-), pp. 163, 178-79. I am indebted to Louis F. Hartman, C.Ss.R. for his kind assistance in clarifying and evaluating the material.

[2]Anton Deimel, S.J., Šumerisches Lexicon, Teil II, Band I (Rom: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut, 1928), 38-39.

[3]Edward William Lane, An Arabic-English Lexicon, Book 1, Part 3 (London: Williams and Norgate, 1867), pp. 870-71. Lane

from the Hebrew[1]). In the dialect of Daṭinah the verb darasa means "to wear smooth; to seek; to be dirty; to dirty."[2] Neither drś nor drs occurs in Fr. Albert Jamme's exceptionally large collection of South Arabic inscriptions (š > ś).

In Ge'ez (š and s > s) drs means "to comment, interpret, explain > compose, write a book"[3]--undoubtedly a borrowing from Aramaic due to the influence of Syrian monasticism. In Tigre drss (dărasăsa) means "to crush" and Leslau relates this to the Amharic dss ("to rub"), surmising the insertion of the r for the purpose of expanding a root with identical sibilants.[4]

The root drš occurs once in the Ugaritic material (š as a probable reading) but the passage is fragmentary and does not

---

regards "to rub, efface" as the basic meaning; also Fahr ad-Dîn ar-Râzî, at-Tafsîr al-kabîr, edited by Muhammad Muḥyîddîn 'Abd al-Ḥamîd (Cairo: Misrîya, 1352-57/1933-38), ad 6,105. We follow Le Comte de Landberg, Glossaire Datinois, I (Leide: E. J. Brill, 1920), 751, and al-'Aṣma'ī, cited by Razi, loc. cit. I am indebted to Dr. Richard M. Frank for his kind assistance with the Arabic portion.

[1]Arthur Jeffery, The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'ān (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1938), pp. 128-29.

[2]Landberg, op. cit., pp. 750-57.

[3]Chr. Fr. August Dillmann, Lexicon linguae Aethiopicae cum indice Latina (Lipsiae: T. O. Weigel, 1865), pp. 1093-94. There is nothing further in Sylvain Grébaut, Supplément au Lexicon linguae Aethiopicae de August Dillmann (1865) et Édition du lexique de Juste d'Urbin (1850-55) (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1952).

[4]Wolf Leslau, Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon ("University of California Publications in Semitic Philology," Vol. 20; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1958), p. 16.

admit of translation;[1] drs does not occur. Neither stem has appeared in the Northwest Semitic inscriptions.[2] In Jewish Aramaic drs means "to tread," and drš means "to examine, question, expound, teach"[3] (probably a loan word from the Hebrew[4]). In Syriac drš means "to tread, dispute, instruct," and drs does not occur.[5]

In view of this material several theories on the etymology of the Hebrew word have been proposed. Nöldeke suggests that there were two distinct stems: drs, "to tread," (occuring in Mishnaic Hebrew) and drš, "to seek" > "to investigate" > "to study" > "to expound."[6] Others prefer to speak of one stem: drš, "to rub with hands or feet" > "to seek" (Gesenius[7]); drš

---

[1]Cyrus H. Gordon, Ugaritic Manual ("Analecta Orientalia," 35; Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1955), p. 132.

[2]Ch. Jean and J. Hoftijzer, Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'Ouest (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960-).

[3]Marcus Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature (New York: Verlag Choreb, 1926), pp. 324-25.

[4]W. Gesenius, Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament (17th ed. by F. Buhl; Leipzig: Vogel, 1921), p. 169.

[5]Carl Brockelmann, Lexicon Syriacum (2nd ed. rev.; Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1923), p. 168.

[6]Theodor Nöldeke, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft (Strassburg: Karl Trübner, 1910), p. 38, n. 4.

[7]Wilhelm Gesenius, Thesaurus Philologicus Criticus Linguae Hebraeae et Chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti, I (Lipsiae: Fr. Chr. Guil. Vogelius, 1835), 357.

or drs, "to tread" > "to seek" (Brockelmann[1]); dš, "to tread" > drš "to tread (?)" > "to seek" (Levy,[2] Siegfried-Stade[3]); dr, "to go around" > drš (by contamination with dš), "to tread" > "to seek" (!) (Landberg[4]). Due to the complex situation reflected by the comparative material above, it seems that a convincing theory on etymology is not attainable. One thing, however, is clear: drš in the meaning of "study" developed only in Hebrew. In this meaning it exists in Arabic and Aramaic as a cultural borrowing from the Hebrew and in Ethiopic as a borrowing from the Aramaic.

Dāraš in the Old Testament

The verb dāraš occurs one hundred and sixty-six times in the OT (including the preserved Hebrew portions of Ben Sira). It exists in the Qal and Niphal only, and it conveys fourteen different, although related, meanings. We list here these meanings (and the occurrences within each meaning) in the chronological order of their appearance in so far as possible, and then discuss in some detail the passages that are pertinent to our investigation. It may be noted at the outset that, while the verb acquired new meanings in the course of time, all of the

---

[1]Brockelmann, loc. cit.

[2]Jacob Levy, Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim, nebst Beiträgen von Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer, I (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1876), 388.

[3]Carl Siegfried und Bernhard Stade, Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testamente (Leipzig: von Veit, 1893), p. 147.

[4]Landberg, op. cit., p. 754.

meanings persisted into the postexilic period and can be found in the works of the Chronicler and, in some cases, even in Sirach.

1. Inquire of, consult (God, heathen gods, the dead, a prophet, a medium in order to seek guidance, knowledge of the future, the will of God). To this meaning the writer would assign the following passages: 1 Sm 9,9; 28,7; Gn 25,22; 3 Kgs 22,7=2 Chr 18,6; 3 Kgs 22,8=2 Chr 18,7; 4 Kgs 1,2.3.6.16 (first occurrence); Ex 18,15; Dt 18,11; 4 Kgs 3,11; 8,8; Is 8,19 (both occurrences); Is 31,1; 19,3; So 1,6; 4 Kgs 22,13=2 Chr 34,21; 4 Kgs 22,18=2 Chr 34,26; Ez 14,3.7.10; 20,1.3 (both occurrences). 31 (both occurrences); Jer 21,2; 37,7; Is 58,2; 65,1; 1 Chr 10, 13.14; Sir 46,15.20.

2. Inquire about, question, investigate: 2 Sm 11,3; Dt 12,30; 13,15; 17,4.9; 19,18; Jgs 6,29; Lv 10,16; 2 Chr 31,9; 32,31; Esd 10,16; Sir 3,20.

3. Beseech (God), ask for (God's word): 4 Kgs 1,16 (second occurrence); 3 Kgs 14,5; 22,5=2 Chr 18,4; Ez 36,37; Ps 77,3; 105,4=1 Chr 16,11; 1 Chr 21,30; 2 Chr 20,3; Ps 34,5.

4. Avenge, seek a reckoning, require an account: Gn 42,22; Dt 18,19; Ez 33,6; Gn 9,5 (three occurrences); Ps 10,4. 13.15; 9,13; 2 Chr 24,22.

5. Resort to (a sanctuary, altar): Am 5,5; Dt 12,5; 2 Chr 1,5.

6. Seek God or false gods (the basic religious attitude manifested by prayer, sacrifice, and obedience): Am 5,4.6; Os 10,12; Is 9,12; Jer 10,21; 29,13; Ps 78,34; 22,27; Jer 8,2; Lam

3,25; Is 55,6; Dt 4,29; Is 65,10; Ps 9,11; 14,2 ‖ 53,3; 24,6; 34,11; 69,33; 1 Chr 22,19; 28,9 (second occurrence); 2 Chr 12,14; 14,3.6 (two occurrences); 15,2.12.13; 17,3.4; 19,3; 22,9; 25,15. 20; 26,5 (two occurrences); 30,19; 31,21; 34,3; Esd 4,2; 6,21; Ps 119,2.10; Sir 32,14.

7. Pursue, practice: Am 5,14; 1 Chr 28,8; Ps 119,45. 94.155.[1]

8. Claim, demand, require of: Mi 6,8; Dt 22,2; 23,22; Ez 20,40; 34,10; 2 Chr 24,6.

9. Promote, work for: Is 1,17; 16,5; Dt 23,7; Jer 29,7; 38,4; Ps 38,13; Esd 9,12; Est 10,3.

10. Look after, take care of: Dt 11,12; Jer 30,14.17; Ez 34,8; Ps 142,5; 1 Chr 13,3; 15,13.

11. Search after, search for: Ez 34,6.11; Jb 3,4; 10,6; 39,8; Prv 11,27[2]; 31,13[3]; Is 34,16; 1 Chr 26,31; Sir 6,26. We might note here the first use of dāraš in connection with a book

---

[1]M. Delcor ("Contribution à l'étude de la législation des sectaires de Damas et de Qumrân," Revue Biblique, 62 [1955], 67), Renée Bloch ("Midrash," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplement, V [1957], col. 1263), and Wilhelm Bacher (Die älteste Terminologie der jüdischen Schriftauslegung [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1899], p. 25) suggest that these three occurrences in Ps 119 are to be taken in the sense of "study," but it is clear from the parallelism and/or the context in each case that the verb means obedience to the Law.

[2]It is impossible to assign a date to this proverb, and therefore it has been disregarded in the chronological ordering of the meanings and of the passages within this category.

[3]"She [the ideal wife] dārᵉšâ wool and flax and works with willing hands." Gesenius (op. cit., p. 356) suggests the

in Is 34,16: "Search in [seek out from] the book of the Lord and read: Not one of these shall be lacking." The verb does not yet contain the notion of "study" but merely of "looking and hunting" for passages so that one may read and verify statements. The "book of the Lord" is probably the Book of Isaiah.

12. Seek out, come to for help or advantage: Is 62,12; 11,10; Jb 5,8; 2 Chr 16,12.

13. Examine (a person's heart): 1 Chr 28,9 (first occurrence).

14. Study: Esd 7,10; Ps 111,2; Eccl 1,13; Sir 32,15.

The first occurrence in the meaning "study" is Esd 7,10. In this passage we are introduced to the scribe, Ezra, who is skilled in the Law of Moses (v. 6) and comes from Babylon to Jerusalem with the hand of God upon him,

> for Ezra had set his heart to seek [lidrôš] the law of Yahweh and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and ordinances.

The phrase "set his heart" conveys the notion of resolution of the will rather than an intellectual operation,[1] and the verb dāraš here may possibly mean "pursue, practice" and thus be

---

translation, "handles," and sees here the only occurrence of drš in the basic meaning ("rub with hands or feet") which he supposes for this root. LXX translates by mēruomenē ("to weave the woof into the warp, to wind off thread"). In lieu of a definite conclusion on etymology and of any parallel usage in the above meanings, we have assigned the passage to this category where it fits well enough, and attribute any lack of harmony with the context to the demands of alphabetic composition under which the author was laboring.

[1] See the parallels: 2 Chr 12,14; Ps 10,17; 78,8; Job 11, 13 etc. Also, here the phrase governs all three infinitives.

synonymous with "do." The passage would then be similar to 1 Chr 28,8: "observe and seek out [šimrû wᵉdiršû] all the commandments of Yahweh, your God."

However, in the light of Ezra's activity later on with regard to mixed marriages, it is clear that Ezra's intent was to scrutinize the Torah so as to determine its exact prescriptions and to put them into effect. Considering, then, this general context as well as the immediate connection of dāraš with the verb "teach," which implies study as well as the direction of others, we would be inclined to assign to our verb here the acceptation "study" and to see dāraš as signifying the acquisition of knowledge of the Torah for the sake of personal keeping of the Law and the instruction of others. "Torah" here would be the book of the Law and indeed the written text thereof (cf. Esd 7,25; Neh 8,2.3.5.8).

Wilhelm Bacher sees in this verse the later meaning "explain, interpret,"[1] and Renée Bloch proposes the same meaning as a possibility.[2] Certainly the study of the Scriptures implies interpretation, and certainly Ezra was faced with the problem of applying the Law to changed circumstances, but it would seem that the primary idea contained in the verb here is the acquiring of

---

[1]Bacher, op. cit., p. 25.

[2]Renée Bloch, "Écriture et tradition dans le Judaïsme, aperçus sur l'origine du midrash," Cahiers Sioniens, 8 (1954), p. 15, n. 21.

knowledge of the Law by study. As for the idea of explaining it or interpreting it to others, this is contained here in the verb "teach."

The second text is Ps 111,2: "Great are the works of the Lord, to be studied [dᵉrûšîm] in all their delights (or by all who delight in them [Targum])." The Ps is a song of praise in honor of God's works, specifically the events of salvation history (v. 5,6,9a) and the Law (v. 7,8,9b). These works He has caused to be remembered (v. 6) in the liturgical feasts and in the Scriptures and it is there that they are to be studied.

Another occurrence of our verb in the meaning of "study" is Eccl 1,13. After initial observations on the monotonous repetition of events in nature and of the activity of men, the author states

> 12 I, Qoheleth, was king over Israel in Jerusalem. 13 And I applied my mind to study [lidrôš] and to observe [wᵉlātûr] by wisdom all that is done under heaven; it is an unhappy business that God has given to the sons of men to be busy with. 14 I have seen everything that is done under the sun; and behold, all is vanity and a striving after wind.

The expression "I gave my heart" (nātattî 'et-libbî) connotes here the application of the mind as it does again in 1,17; 7,21; 8,9.16. The activity to which his mind was applied, if we may judge from his book, was philosophical speculation on the vanity of all things. Qoheleth applied his mind to know wisdom, madness and folly (1,17); he made a test of pleasure and searched (tûr) with his mind--guided by wisdom--to see what is good for men to do (2,1-3); he examined how the righteous are in the hands

of God and how everything before them is vanity (9,1), etc. Qoheleth's aim then was to gather data, test it, examine and reflect upon it, and this he apparently wished to express in a general way by dāraš and tûr in 1,13. The precise meaning of the dāraš is a little more difficult to ascertain. Tûr means "to seek out, to spy, to go about," and only in Eccl is it used of an intellectual act. In Eccl 2,3 it clearly means "to search for, to look around, to find out how to do something." The only other occurrence in Eccl 7,25, is similar to 1,13. Tûr, then, in 1,13 very likely means "explore, observe, bring in data." The dāraš could be synonymous with this (= investigate, search out), but if we take this verse as a general statement describing all that Qoheleth had done (including testing, examining, and reflecting), then dāraš would not be synonymous with tûr but should be taken in the sense of "study, examine, search into thoroughly" (and thus Podechard, Delitzsch, Barton, Gordis).[1]

The object of this study, "all that is done under heaven," is primarily the activity of men, but also events in nature (1,9) and the divine activity (8,17). Wisdom is the means by which the philosophical speculation is to be accomplished--undoubtedly the

---

[1]E. Podechard, L'Ecclésiaste ("Études Bibliques"; Paris: Gabalda, 1912), p. 248; Franz Delitzsch, Commentary on the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes, trans. M. G. Easton (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1891), pp. 226-27; Geo. A. Barton, The Book of Ecclesiastes ("International Critical Commentary"; New York: Scribner's, 1908), p. 78; Robert Gordis, Koheleth--The Man and His World (New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1955), p. 199.

wisdom of the author.

The fourth and last occurrence of dāraš in the meaning "study" is in Sir 32,15:

14 He who seeks [dôrēš] God must accept discipline;
he who seeks him obtains an answer.

15 He who studies [dôrēš] the Torah masters it [yāpîqennāh]
but the hypocrite becomes ensnared in it.

This verse occurs in a small section on the Torah (32,14-33,3 or 4) and the verses which follow it offer a commentary: He who fears God has sound judgment and out of the obscurity of the Torah draws a clear plan of action (16). Being humble, thoughtful and prudent, he accepts direction (18a) and counsel (19a) and draws upon his training (33,4--if this verse is part of the section on the Torah); thus the Torah is for him as dependable as a divine oracle (33,3). On the other hand, the hypocrite (apparently the man who studies the Torah but does not keep it) distorts the Torah to suit his own purposes (17b) and in his pride neglects direction (18) and the Torah thereby becomes a snare for him.

Isaac Heinemann in discussing this passage proposes that the dôrēš in line 15 expresses the same idea of devotion as the dôrēš in line 14, and he argues for this from the parallelism.[1] The two verses certainly are not parallel structurally, and the

---

[1]Isaac Heinemann, "The Development of the Terms of Biblical Interpretation [Heb.]," Lešônēnû, 14 (1946), 183; Idem., Darkê ha-Aggadah (2d ed.; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Press, 1954), p. 173. Heinemann does not admit the meaning "study" for

present writer finds it difficult to see even a parallel in thought between 14 and 15. Above all, however, it would seem that the verb yāpîqennāh demands the meaning "study" in line 15 and that Heinemann's suggestion does not fit the text.

Midrāš in the Old Testament

The first occurrences of the word midrāš in the OT are in the second book of Chronicles: "The rest of the acts of Abijah, his ways and his sayings, are written in the Midrash of the prophet Iddo" (2 Chr 13,22); "As for his [Joash'] sons, the many oracles against him, and the rebuilding of the Temple, these are written in the Midrash of the Book of the Kings" (2 Chr 24,27).

These two passages bring us into the heart of the problem of the Chronicler's sources. Like the author of Kgs, the Chronicler usually refers the reader at the end of each reign to some definite source or sources where further particulars are to be found, and in the course of the two books he names twenty-one historical and prophetical works which are, for the most part, otherwise unknown to us.

1. "The Book of the Kings of Israel"--2 Chr 20,34 (Jehoshaphat)
2. "The Acts of the Kings of Israel and Judah"--2 Chr 33,18 (Manasseh)

---

dāraš in the OT or in Sirach, but holds that, when dāraš is used in connection with Torah, it always means obedience to the Law. Since Heinemann writes in reaction to Gesenius-Buhl and is interested only in the usage of dāraš with tôrâ, mišpat, etc., he overlooks Ps 111,2 and Eccl 1,13. Sirach 32,15 he treats as above, and in Esd 7,10 he admits the possibility of "study, interpret" but concludes against it because according to him there is no other occurrence in this meaning.

3. "The Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah"--1 Chr 9,1 (for genealogies); 2 Chr 27,7 (Jotham); 35,27 (Josiah); 36,8 (Jehoiakim)
4. "The Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel"--2 Chr 16,11 (Asa); 25,26 (Amaziah); 28,26 (Ahaz); 32,32 (Hezekiah)
5. "The Midrash of the Book of the Kings"--2 Chr 24,27 (Joash)
6. "The Acts of Samuel the Seer"--1 Chr 29,29 (David)
7. "The Acts of the Prophet Nathan"--1 Chr 29,29 (David); 2 Chr 9,29 (Solomon)
8. "The Acts of Gad the Seer"--1 Chr 29,29 (David)
9. "The Prophecy of Ahia of Silo"--2 Chr 9,29 (Solomon)
10. "The Visions of Yedo the Seer"--2 Chr 9,29 (Solomon)
11. "The Acts of Shemaiah the Prophet"--2 Chr 12,15 (Rehoboam)
12. "The Acts of Iddo the Seer"--2 Chr 12,15 (Rehoboam)
13. "The Midrash of the Prophet Iddo"--2 Chr 13,22 (Abijah)
14. "The Acts of Jehu, Son of Hanani, which are inserted in the Book of the Kings of Israel"--2 Chr 20,34 (Jehoshaphat)
15. The history of Uzziah written by the prophet Isaiah, the son of Amos--2 Chr 26,22
16. "The vision of Isaiah, son of Amos, in the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel"--2 Chr 32,32 (Hezekiah)
17. "The Acts of Hozai"--2 Chr 33,19 (Manasseh)
18. "The Lamentations"--2 Chr 35,25
19. "The Chronicles of King David"--2 Chr 27,24
20. A genealogical register--1 Chr 5,7
21. "The Later Acts of David"--1 Chr 23,27

Some deny the existence of these works cited by the Chronicler and see them as a parading of authorities,[1] but the majority of commentators accepts them as real documents and ones which the Chronicler utilized. Assuming for the sake of discussion that these works did exist and were used by the Chronicler, can we

---

[1]C. C. Torrey, "The Chronicler as Independent Narrator," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, 25 (1909), 195; reprinted in Ezra Studies (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1910). Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, 2d ed. (New York: Harper, 1948), pp. 805-806; W. A. L. Elmslie, "The First and Second Books of Chronicles," The Interpreter's Bible, III (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), 347 (existence of the sources is doubtful).

arrive in any way at the nature of our two midrashim?

The most we can say with certainty is that the two works in question contained at least some historical material, and this from the way in which the two compositions are cited. Any statement on the amount of material contained in them depends upon one's view as to the number of distinct works the Chronicler mentions. Most would identify the "Midrash of the Book of the Kings" with numbers 1-4 above and see this single work as a rather extensive historical composition covering the monarchical period, distinct from the canonical books of Samuel and Kings.[1] Some would also see many of the prophetic works (including the Midrash of the prophet Iddo) as sections of this larger work.[2]

To attempt to specify further the nature of all the

---

[1]Karl Budde, "Vermutungen zum 'Midrasch des Buches der Könige,'" Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 12 (1892), 37-38; E. L. Curtis and A. A. Madsen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles ("International Critical Commentary"; New York: Scribner's, 1910), pp. 23-24 (the probability); E. Podechard, "Les références du Chroniqueur," Revue Biblique, 12 (1915), 241; Otto Eissfeldt, Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1934), pp. 603-604; Johann Goettsberger, Die Bücher der Chronik oder Paralipomenon ("Bonnerbibel"; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1939), p. 6; Aage Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament (2d ed.: Copenhagen: Gad, 1952), II, 212; Kurt Galling, Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra, Nehemia ("Das Alte Testament Deutsch"; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1954), p. 8; Wilhelm Rudolph, Chronikbücher ("Handbuch zum Alten Testament"; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955), p. xi; A. M. Brunet, "Paralipomènes," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, VI (Paris: Letouzey, 1960), col. 1238.

[2]Budde, loc. cit.; Curtis-Madsen, loc. cit.; Eissfeldt, loc. cit.; Bentzen, loc. cit.; Rudolph, loc. cit.; Goettsberger, op. cit., pp. 6-8.

material in this work (these works) and the manner in which it was presented from a literary analysis of Chron would seem to the present writer to be a very risky business. It is generally admitted that apart from the sections reproduced from Samuel-Kings the style of the book of Chronicles is uniform.[1] It is also clear that in handling the canonical sources the Chronicler both reproduces his sources intact and rewrites, suppresses, expands and changes them.[2] Since the style is uniform, then in handling the non-canonical sources the Chronicler either largely excerpted[3] or else largely reworked the material in his own style.[4] If the former obtains, then we have much of the non-canonical sources before us--but this is highly unlikely in view of the Chronicler's method in handling the canonical material. If the latter is the case, then we can arrive at no clear idea of the nature of the original works. And in neither case would we be in a position to say what sections came from the Midrashim and what sections came from other sources, oral or written. We

---

[1]Brunet, op. cit., col. 1235; S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (10th ed.; New York: Scribner's, 1903), pp. 531-32; Curtis-Madsen, op. cit., p. 24.

[2]Adrien-M. Brunet, O.P., "Le Chroniste et ses sources," Revue Biblique 60 (1953), 481-508; 61 (1954), 349-86.

[3]Goettsberger, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

[4]Driver, op. cit., pp. 531-2; Rudolph, op. cit., pp. xii-xiii; Curtis-Madsen, op. cit., p. 26; Brunet, "Paralipomènes," col. 1235.

cannot even be sure that the Chronicler acquired his method of historiography from the sources, as Driver suggests;[1] the Chronicler could very well have acquired it independently from them. Therefore, a literary analysis of Chronicles can offer very little information on the nature of the non-canonical sources.

In the face of this situation, many have tried to work back to the nature of our Midrashim through the word "midrash" itself. Solomon Zeitlin points out the frequent use of dāraš in the OT in the meaning of "inquire (of a prophet)" and concludes that

> the prophecies which the seers and the prophets delivered to the kings were kept in writing and were called the Midrash, i.e., the books in which were recorded the inquiries of the kings and the answers and explanations of the seers and the prophets.[2]

This is certainly a possibility not only for the Midrash of the prophet Iddo but also for the Midrash of the Book of Kings (partitive or appositive genitive). However, it should be noted that according to Chr the Midrash of the prophet Iddo is made up of at least partly of "the rest of the acts of Abijah, and his ways and his sayings," and the Midrash of the Book of the Kings contains not only the oracles against Joash but also information on his sons and on the rebuilding of the Temple. This does not exclude Zeitlin's concept of the work, but it indicates

---

[1]Driver, op. cit., p. 532.

[2]Solomon Zeitlin, "Midrash: A Historical Study," The Jewish Quarterly Review, 44 (1953), 24-25.

that the Midrash was not simply a book of questions and answers, nor valued primarily as such.

Not a few have assumed that the word "midrash" in Chr has a later rabbinical acceptation and that it designates an imaginative development of a Scriptural text along didactic, homiletic and edifying lines.[1] They then proceed to point out that this is the character of both passages in connection with which the term occurs, and of many others in Chr, e.g., 2 Chr 14,8-15,15; 20; 28,5-15; 33,10-19, etc. Budde calls attention to the fact that edifying stories similar to those in Chr which are supposed to come from the lost Midrash of the Book of the Kings are found in other parts of the OT and conjectured that the Prayer of Manasseh and the Books of Jonah and Ruth are derived from the same work, extracts from which he surmises in 1 Sam 16,1-13 and 1 Kgs 13.[2]

To describe the Midrashim on the basis of the later history of the word is a very questionable procedure. There is no data to suggest that the noun already possessed its rabbinical acceptation in the time of Chr, and it must be remembered that

---

[1]Driver, op. cit., p. 529, and the many who follow him; Podechard, "Les références . . . ," pp. 239-41; Curtis-Madsen, op. cit., p. 23; Budde, op. cit., pp. 37-38; George F. Moore, "Historical Literature," Encyclopaedia Biblica, ed. T. K. Cheyme and J. Sutherland Black, II (New York: Macmillan, 1899), col. 2084; Bloch, "Midrash," col. 1264 (the probability); L. Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden (2d ed. by N. Brüll; Frankfurt: J. Kauffmann, 1892), p. 38.

[2]Budde, op. cit.

in the OT the verb dāraš itself did not possess its later, technical meaning of "expound, interpret." As for the midrashic character of passages in Chr, these sections are not found exclusively in connection with the word "midrash," and even if they were, as we have already remarked, their character would not necessarily stem from the Midrash but could be due solely to the Chronicler's method of handling his sources, and in chapters 13 and 24 especially do we find peculiarities of the Chronicler's style.[1] Furthermore, not only may we not attribute the later meaning to the noun "midrash" as found here; we must not simpliciter equate the type of historiography found in Chr with the later rabbinical methods, but discussion of this will be reserved for a later section. Finally, the similarities which Budde points out are sufficiently explained by the supposition that these writings, together with other pieces of the same kind in the OT, are the products of the same age and school; that they were all taken from the same book is hardly to be proved.

As a reaction to this anachronistic treatment of the word "midrash," several scholars have assigned to the word the weaker meaning "treatise, work, book" (= either "study, investigation," or "book" as object of study, just as mikrā', "Scripture,"

---

[1]Driver, op. cit., pp. 535-40; Curtis-Madsen, op. cit., pp. 28-36; Rudolph, op. cit., p. 238.

means object of reading),[1] or "teaching (place where one searches for truth)."[2] Support for these positions is found in the LXX: epi biliō tou prophētou Addō (13,22),[3] epi tēn graphēn tōn basileōn (24,27);[4] and in the Vulgate: scripta sunt diligentissime in libro prophetae Addo (13,22), scripta sunt diligentius in libro regum (24,27). This translation "book" fits the context of 13,22 but is not altogether satisfactory in 24,27 where the word "book" is already in the Hebrew: kᵉtûbîm ʿal-midraš sēper hammᵉlākîm. Of all the proponents of this theory only Bacher and Eissfeldt acknowledge the difficulty and suggest on the basis of the LXX that either sēper is a gloss for clarification and thus the lack of biblion in the LXX (Bacher, Eissfeldt), or that midraš sēper is a pleonasm (cf. mᵉgillat sēper: Jer 36,2; Ez 2,9; Ps 40,8) rendered with one word by LXX and thus the change from biblion (as in 13,22) to graphē in 24,27 (Bacher).[5]

Brunet takes exception to this trend in the interpreta-

---

[1]Eissfeldt, op. cit., p. 605; Goettsberger, op. cit., p. 6; Bentzen, op. cit., p. 213; Galling, op. cit., pp. 108, 138; Rudolph, op. cit., p. 238; Bacher, op. cit., p. 104.

[2]C. C. Torrey, op. cit., p. 193 n.

[3]One MS (Codex Chigianus) reads: en tē ekzētēsei Addouk tou prophētou.

[4]Three MSS (Codex Chigianus, MS 330 Vat. Lib., No. 93) read: epi tēn graphēn bibliou tōn basileōn.

[5]Eissfeldt, op. cit., p. 603, n.; Bacher, op. cit., pp. 104-105.

tion of the word and points out that if "midrash" in our passage meant simply "book, account," then in the time of the Chronicler the word had temporarily lost its root-meaning (dr̄š = search) only to regain it in later times--a truly astonishing phenomenon. He also points out the problem of the sēper in 24,27. Brunet therefore proposes the meaning "meditation, consideration" on the book of the kings. He further suggests that the object of this Midrash was the canonical book of Kings and that the Midrash would be something of the nature of the LXX passage, 3 Kgs 12,24a-z (which does not appear in the Hebrew or Vulgate). This passage would not be an excerpt from the Midrash but only a sample of the type of thing that was done to material in Kings and at an apparently early date.[1] This is an attractive theory--but still a theory, hinging on a meaning rather freely assigned to the word "midrash." And it should be pointed out that the acceptation, "book, treatise," does not depart from the root meaning as can be seen in the discussion above.

Robert North proposes as the meaning of midrash "explanation; even research, or commentary," and suggests that the midrash on Kgs was a collection of explanations and facts gradually found needful or interesting at the side of the Kgs narrative.[2] Rinaldi similarly suggests "explanation, unfolding of existing oral and

---

[1]Brunet, Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, cols. 1236-37.

[2]Robert North, Israel's Chronicle (1st preliminary ed., mimeographed; St. Mary's, Kansas, 1963), pp. 354-55.

written reports" as the meaning of midrash in Chr.[1] Again we have an interesting possibility, but again also we have the assigning of a meaning which is attested only at a later date and which cannot be demonstrated for this period.

In fine, it would seem that we must agree with Strack and say that the meaning of the word in both these passages is uncertain.[2]

The only other occurrence of midrāš in the OT is in the alphabetic canticle which ends the work of Ben Sira:

> Turn to me, you who need instruction
> And lodge in my house of midrash (school).
>
> penû 'ēlay sᵉkālîm
> welînû bᵉbêt midrāšî (Sir 51,23)

This is the first occurrence of the technical term bêt-hammidrāš, common in later Hebrew as a designation of a rabbinical school for the study of the Scriptures,[3] and because of its early appearance here, Israel Lévi suggests that it is a later interpola-

---

[1] G. Rinaldi, "Alcuni termini ebraici relativi alla letteratura," Biblica, 40 (1959), 277.

[2] Hermann Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash (New York: Meridian Books, 1959 [reprint of 1931 Eng. trans.]), p. 239, n. 36. Also Bloch, "Écriture et tradition . . . ," p. 15, n. 21, but later in "Midrash," col. 1264, she changes her position and states that the works mentioned by the Chronicler are probably historical works which gloss Scripture to instruct and edify.

[3] Bacher, op. cit., p. 103.

tion and that the original probably read bêt mûsār.[1] Of course, it is quite possible that a medieval copyist may have changed the original phrase to his customary expression for "school." Yet the mere fact that this would be the earliest occurrence of the expression does not make its appearance here intrinsically impossible. However, there is much to be said in favor of Lévi's position on other grounds. First of all the suffix (midrāšî) is not reflected in the Greek (en oikō paideias) or in the Syriac (bêt yulpânâ')--a minor point but one providing a slight cause for doubt. Secondly, the Greek paideia is almost a strict equivalent of mûsār not only in meaning but also in LXX usage; and the Syriac rendering, yulpânâ', is used occasionally for mûsār. Thirdly, the initial word in the line is obviously corrupt, for the alphabetic arrangement demands a samech. We could transpose the sᵉkālîm,[2] but the Greek and the

---

[1]Israel Lévi, L'Ecclésiastique ou la sagesse de Jésus, fils de Sira, II (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1901), 229. Others accept it as original: Rudolph Smend, Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, I (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1906), 508; Norbert Peters, Der hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus (Freiburg im B.: Herder, 1902), p. 314; idem, Das Buch Jesus Sirach oder Ecclesiasticus ("Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament"; Münster: Aschendorff, 1913), pp. 450-51; S. Schechter and C. Taylor, The Wisdom of Ben Sira (Cambridge: The University Press, 1899), p. 68; W. O. E. Oesterley, The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach or Ecclesiasticus ("Cambridge Bible"; Cambridge: The University Press, 1912), p. 353; Hermann Strack, Die Sprüche Jesus', des Sohnes Sirachs (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1903), p. 56; idem, Introduction . . . , p. 240, n. 41; Vinzenz Hamp, Sirach ("Echterbibel"; Würzburg: Echter, 1951), p. 144; M. S. Segal, Sēper Ben Sîra hašālēm (Jerusalem: M. Bialik, 1953), p. 362; Bloch, "Midrash," col. 1263.

[2]CCD Trans.; Peters, Der Hebräische Text . . . , p. 314 (although he admits sûrû as a possibility also in his Das Buch Jesus Sirach, p. 450).

Syriac indicate that it is the verb that comes first. Therefore, with the majority of the authors[1] we should read sûrû for pᵉnû on the basis of the same construction in Wisdom's invitation in Prv 9,4 (= 16), a parallel which Sirach is almost certainly imitating. Now, when our author is out for a pun on mûsār in 6,22, he uses the verb sûr[2] and perhaps did it again in our passage--another indication that mûsār may have been the original reading. Lastly, since Ben Sira himself says that it is mûsār that he has written in his book (50,27) and since he calls upon his readers to heed his mûsār (41,14), it would certainly not be surprising that he would call his school (or his book[3]) a house of mûsār.[4]

On the side of the authenticity of the reading midrāš, it could be said that the LXX used paideia to render midrāš be-

---

[1]Smend, op. cit., I, 508; Lévi, op. cit., II, 229; Hamp, op. cit., p. 144; Strack, Die Sprüche Jesus' . . . , p. 56. Segal, loc. cit., and Peters, Das Buch Jesus Sirach, p. 450--the possibility.

[2]"Discipline [mûsār] is like her name [i.e., mûsār (Hophal partic. of sûr) = "withdrawn"], she is not accessible to many." Mûsār (m.) is treated as fem. throughout the verse = "wisdom." This passage was pointed out to me by Msgr. Patrick Skehan.

[3]Hamp, op. cit., p. 144; Peters, Das Buch Jesus Sirach . . . , p. 451 and others.

[4]M. S. Segal (loc. cit.), while accepting midrāšî as the original, observes that the Greek and Syriac read as though either mûsārî or limmûdî were the original reading. In the only occurrence of limmûd in Sir (51,28): "Listen children to my teaching [limmûdî]," the LXX has paideia for limmûd and the Syriac yulpānā', so limmûd would be another possibility for the verse under discussion here.

cause the latter term was unfamiliar to its Greek audience,[1] or that midrāš was approximately synonymous with paideia at that time, but this still leaves the problem of the independent Syriac translation which could have used the noun madrâšâ' or madreštâ'.

While the above evidence is not conclusive, still it does raise serious doubt as to the original reading of our text. Therefore, we shall omit an analysis of the word "midrash" here since any conclusions would be affected by the same uncertainty and hence would be of little value for our discussion.

It might be mentioned here at the conclusion of the OT section, that an investigation in Hatch-Redpath of Greek stems used in connection with the root drš produced nothing of significance for our study from the Deuterocanonical and Apocryphal works covered by that concordance.

Dāraš in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The verb dāraš has occurred forty-one times to date in the Qumrân literature (QL), in nine of the OT meanings and in the new meaning "interpret, expound."

1. Beseech, ask for (a word from someone): 1QSa 2,10.
2. Seek God: CD 1,10; 6,6; 1QS 1,1; 5,11;[2] 1QSb 5,23; 1QH 4,6.14.15.16.

---

[1] Peters, Hebräische Text . . . , p. 314; Segal, loc. cit.

[2] Drŝhw (a third plural form; the text originally read drŝw but was deliberately corrected by the scribe to drŝhw). Géza

3. Practice, follow: 1QS 5,9; 8,24; 1QH 2,34.

4. Promote, work for: CD 6,21 = 6QD 4,3.

5. Look after, take care of: CD 14,16.[1]

6. Seek out someone: 1QH 4,24.[2]

7. Look for, search for: 1QH 5,9.

8. Examine (a person's spirit, etc.): CD 15,11; 1QS 5,20; 6,14.17.

9. Study: 1QS 6,6.7; 8,12.

The first of these occurrences in the meaning of "study" appears in a section of the Manual of Discipline which deals with

---

Vermès, Discovery in the Judean Desert (New York: Desclée, 1956), p. 141; Theodor H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1956), p. 47; G. Lambert, "Le Manuel de Discipline de la grotte de Qumrân: étude historique et traduction intégrale," Nouvelle revue théologique, 73 (1951), 964 and A. M. Habermann, Megilloth Midbar Yehuda (Jerusalem: Mahbarot Lesifrut, 1959), p. 64 apparently regard it as an alternate form of the 3 pl. verb (= study) and J. van der Ploeg in "Le 'Manuel de Discipline' des rouleaux de la Mer Morte," Bibliotheca Orientalis, 8 (1951), 119 explicitly suggests that it is incorrect or popular orthography. Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Secker and Warburg, 1956), p. 377; P. Wernberg-Møller, The Manual of Discipline ("Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah," ed. J. van der Ploeg, Vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 1957), p. 28; J. T. Milik, "Manuale disciplinae," Verbum Domini, 29 (1951), 143; W. H. Brownlee, The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline ("Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Supplementary Studies," 10-12; New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951), p. 20 read it with a suffix 3s.m. (= seek God) and this seems to be the case.

[1]The text as we have it is fragmentary, but J. T. Milik [Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea ("Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 26; London: SCM Press, 1959), p. 119] corrects and supplements the text on the basis of unpublished fragments from 4Q and assigns this meaning to the verb.

[2]The niphal participle of drš is conjectured to fill in a lacuna: hndr[šym].

the details of the life of the community:

> 3 . . . And in every place where there are ten men of the council of the community let there not fail to be among them one 4 who is a priest, and each according to his rank will sit before him; and thus they shall be asked for their counsel regarding everything. And when they prepare the table to eat or the wine 5 to drink, the priest shall first stretch out his hand to invoke a blessing upon the first portion of the bread or the wine . . . 6 . [dittography] . . And in whatever place the ten are let there not fail to be a man who studies (in) the Torah [*'yš dwrš btwrh*] day and night 7 continually, in relays, each man for his neighbor.[1] (1QS 6,3-7)

---

[1] "In relays . . . neighbor" [*'l ypwt 'yš lr'hw*]. Lambert (*op. cit.*, p. 965) understands *ypwt* as the root *yph* with *-ut* afformative = "what is fitting, proper, appropriate" and then translates "to know the duties of each" with van der Ploeg (*op. cit.*, p. 120). Also Gaster (*op. cit.*, p. 49): "for the harmonious adjustment of their human relations"; Milik ("Manuale," p. 145): "*ad mutuam utilitatem*"; Vermès (*op. cit.*, p. 143): "for the improvement of all." In post-Biblical Hebrew *yph* can mean "right, privilege" but not "duty"; and both "right" and "what is appropriate" are strange fruits of Torah-study. Vermès and Milik's versions are possible but awkward. Brownlee's *'l pywt*, "orally," is an odd plural usage and results in an even odder picture of the activity prescribed (*op. cit.*, p. 22).

Since the text is an attempt to put into effect literally the command of Jos 1,8 (cf. Ps 1,2) to meditate upon the Law day and night, then the thing we would naturally expect would be a statement of how this is to be done and not of what is to be derived from it. Thus it would seem that H. Yalon ("Review of M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls II*, fasc. 2," *Kirjath Sepher*, 28 [1952], 65), Wernberg-Møller (*op. cit.*, p. 41), Isaiah Sonne ("Remarks on 'Manual of Discipline,' Col. VI, 6-7," *Vetus Testamentum*, 7 [1957], 405-408), Burrows (*op. cit.*, p. 378), Habermann (*op. cit.*, p. 65), K. G. Kuhn (*Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1960], p. 72) are right in reading *'lypwt* (= *hlypwt*), the classical term for taking turns (cf. 3 Kgs 5,28). Cf. P. Wernberg-Møller, "Observations on the Interchange of *Ayin* and *Het* in the Manual of Discipline," *Vetus Testamentum*, 3 (1953), 104-107. The translation would then read: "continually, *by relays*, each man for his neighbor" (i.e., each man satisfying the obligation for his neighbor).

Otto Betz (*Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* [Tübingen. J. C. B. Mohr, 1960], pp. 19-20), who translates: "was im Umgang mit dem Nächsten geziemt," objects to the suggestion *hlypwt*. He feels that it fits poorly with *tmyd*; he

If we are right in assuming that the 'lypwt alludes to the personal study of the Law as carried out by the relief of one member on duty by another member, then there is clearly no question here of one man being wholly dedicated to the study of the Law[1] or of one man "who can interpret the Law to them at any time of day or night."[2]

This regulation of the community is an attempt to fulfill literally the injunction in Jos 1,8:

> This book of the Law shall not depart out of your mouth, but you shall meditate on it day and night, that you may be careful to act according to all that is written in it. (cf. Ps 1,2)

There is to be no such specious reasoning as is found among some teachers of the Law that, if one recites the Shema in the morning and in the evening, one satisfies the Law. The study is to be

---

questions all three of Wernberg-Møller's examples of the interchange of Ayin and Het in 1QS; and he observes that the facsimile clearly shows 'l ypwt as two words.

We fail to see the conflict with tmyd. We readily admit, however, that the expression is written as two words in the scroll but would explain this by the hypothesis of a scribe who, copying from dictation, did not know precisely how the expression was spelt. It is a desperate solution, but it seems to be the only one that makes sense out of the line.

[1]Thus Vermès (op. cit., p. 143, n.), Delcor (op. cit., p. 67), Lambert (op. cit., p. 965), Frank Moore Cross, Jr. (The Ancient Library of Qumrân and Modern Biblical Studies [New York: Doubleday and Co., 1958], p. 173, n.), A. Dupont-Sommer (Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la mer Morte [Paris: Maisonneuve, 1953], p. 138), and Betz (op. cit., pp. 19-20).

[2]Thus Gaster, op. cit., p. 49.

done continually (tmyd), and, if each man takes his turn in succession, the community as a whole can then satisfy its obligation.[1]

Since Jos 1,8 is the context in which our passage is to be read, our verb is best rendered in the meaning of "study." "Search" and "interpret" are much too narrow to express the idea which seems to be demanded.

The second occurrence of drš = study is in the following line:

> 7 . . . And let the Many keep watch in common the third part of all the nights of the year to read from the book and to study law (wldrwš mšpt) 8 and to recite the blessings in common (1QS 6,7-8)

The expression drš mšpṭ occurs twice in Is (1,17 and 16,5) where it means "to promote, work for justice," and in one other place in the QL, 1QS 8,24 (drš hmšpṭ) where the only translation satisfactory to the present writer is "they will follow the ordinance: he must neither judge . . ." (with Lambert and Milik[2]). However, none of these passages casts any light on our present text.

In the QL the singular mšpṭ, when not used to designate a single ordinance of the community, usually means "justice,

---

[1]Sonne, op. cit.

[2]Lambert, op. cit., p. 970; Milik, "Manuale," p. 150.

judgment," and thus Burrows,[1] van der Ploeg,[2] and Lambert[3] translate here: "search for justice," but this makes little sense in the context. Perhaps Milik's "in studio justitiae" is the sense.[4] However, the plural mšptym is used in 1QS and CD to designate the divine laws (1QS 3,5; CD 14,7) or, more often, the laws of the community (1QS 6,15.24; 8,20; CD 12,19,14,7 etc.). Perhaps in 1QS 5,16; 6,22; 9,17 the singular mšpṭ designates practical application of the Torah or perhaps it is used of the whole collection of the community's legal material. In any case we feel that one or the other is the meaning here (probably the latter with Wernberg-Møller, Brownlee and Delcor[5]) and that the Many are to study (not "interpret") this legal code so as to be able to perform their judicial role in the community. It is not clear what book is to be read aloud, probably the Scriptures, but perhaps the mysterious book of HHGW (HHGY) in 1QSa 1,7; CD 10,6; 13,2; 14,7 which may have been a halakic handbook in which

---

[1] Burrows, op. cit., p. 378.

[2] van der Ploeg, op. cit., p. 120.

[3] Lambert, op. cit., p. 965.

[4] Milik, "Manuale," p. 45; the same author in Ten Years . . . , p. 104 translates: "to read in the Book, to explain its meaning, etc." and states that this should be understood as the application of the hermeneutical principles of the pᵉšarîm. It is hard to see how mšpṭ can have this meaning.

[5] Wernberg-Moller, op. cit., p. 30; Brownlee, op. cit., p. 24; Delcor, op. cit., p. 67.

were recorded the regulations of the sect.[1]

In 1QS 8,12 we find another reference to the continual study of the Torah mentioned in 6,6:

> 10 . . . When these men [the initiates] are established in the fundamentals of the community for two years in perfect conduct, 11 they shall be separated as holy within the council of the men of the community. And as for every matter hidden from Israel and uncovered by whoever 12 is studying (l'yš hdwrš) let him not conceal it from these out of a fear of a spirit of apostasy.

The term "council of the community" in this section designates the whole community as it does throughout the document.

As we see elsewhere, the sect believed that it alone had come to be entrusted with the mysteries of God (CD 3,12; 4,4; 1QS 11,5-8), mysteries that had been revealed to it or found by members of the community through their interpretation of the Law (1QS 5,8-11; 8,1; 9,13). One of the prime responsibilities of those trained in these mysteries was to keep them hidden from outsiders (1QS 4,6; 9,17.22), and in our passage we see that the mysteries were not to be divulged even to the initiates until they had completed the full two years of formation, and that to these full-fledged members the hidden things must be revealed because there is no reason to fear that a spirit of apostasy will henceforth affect them. These hidden things which are found in the course of the study of the Torah are wisdom, the mysteries to come (1QS 11,3-6), His sabbaths and feasts, His

---

[1]Wernberg-Møller, op. cit., p. 123.

ordinances and true ways, and the desires of His will (CD 3,14-15).[1]

That the "man who is studying" is the same as the one in 6,6 seems certain, and thus no particular man holding a special office is alluded to here. As Wernberg-Møller points out, the definite article is due to the peculiar Hebrew usage of the article to denote a single person (as yet unknown) as being present to the mind under given circumstances.[2] Generally in such cases English would use the indefinite article. Since the reference here then is to 6,6, the meaning of our verb is the same, "study."

10. Interpret, expound: CD 1,18; 6,7; 7,18; 1QH 2,15.32; 4Qp Nah 1,2.7; 2,2.4; 3,3.6; 4Qp Is^{c} 10; 4Q Fl 1,11.

Ten times in the QL we find the phrase "seek after smooth things." In CD 1,18 those who were led astray by the "man of scorn" are said to have "sought smooth things [dršw bḥlqwt] and chosen illusions. They looked for breaches. . . . They justified the wicked and condemned the just. They transgressed the covenant and violated the statute" (CD 1,18-20).

In the Hodayot the psalmist boasts:

---

[1]For a brief summary of "mysteries" in the QL see Raymond E. Brown, S.S., "The Pre-Christian Semitic Concept of 'Mystery,'" Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 20 (1958), 436-43.

[2]Wernberg-Møller, op. cit., p. 128; cf. W. Gesenius and E. Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar (rev. A. E. Cowley; 2d Eng. ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), no. 126 q.

I am a man of strife to deceiving interpreters
[but a man of pea]ce to all who see straight things.
I am a spirit of zeal opposed to all who seek smooth things
(dwršy hl[qwt]) (1QH 2,14-15).

And again:

I thank you, Adonai,
For [you have set] your eye upon me
And have rescued me from the zeal of lying interpreters
And from the congregation of those who seek after smooth things
(dwršy hlqwt) (1QH 2,31-32).

Our phrase also occurs in 4Qp Nah 1,2

[. . . Its interpretation concerns Deme]trius, king of Greece, who sought to enter Jerusalem by the counsel of the seekers-after-smooth-things [dwršy hhlqwt]

and again in line 7:

6 Its interpretation concerns the Lion of Wrath, 7 . . . . . death [?] by the seekers-after-smooth-things [bdwršy hhlqwt], who hangs [or, used to hang, or, would hang] men up alive. . . .

It appears in 4Qp Nah 2,2.4

1 . . . "Woe city of blood, all full of [lies and rap]ine." 2 Its interpretation: it is the city of Ephraim, the seekers-after-smooth-things [dwršy hhlqwt] at the end of days, who in "lies" and falsehood[s] conduct themselves. 3 "Prey departeth not and the sound of the whip and the sound of the rattling of wheels, and galloping horses and bounding chariots, the horseman charging, a blade 4 and flashing spear and a multitude of slain and a great heap of carcases: and there is no end to the corpses and they shall stumble over their bodies." Its interpretation concerns the rule of the seekers-after-smooth-things [dwršy hhlqwt] 5 when there shall not depart from the midst of their congregation the Gentile sword, captivity and plunder, and heated strife among themselves, and exile from fear of the enemy, and a multitude of 6 guilty corpses shall fall in their days and there shall be no end to the total of their slain, and furthermore, in their fleshly natures they shall stumble over their own guilty counsel

and again in 4Qp Nah 3,3.6

1 . . . "And I will cast upon thee detested things, and I will treat thee with contempt and make thee 2 repulsive

and all who look on thee will flee from thee." 3 Its interpretation concerns the seekers-after-smooth-things [dwršy hhlqwt] whose evil deeds will be revealed at the end of time to all Israel, 4 and many will discern their iniquity and hate them and consider them repulsive because of their guilty insolence and the ruin of Judah's glory. 5 The simple ones of Ephraim will flee from the midst of their assembly and forsake those who mislead them and join themselves to Israel. And they shall say, 6 "Nineveh is laid waste; who will mourn for her? Whence shall I seek comforters for thee?" Its interpretation concerns the seekers-after- 7 smooth-things [dwršy hhlqwt] whose counsel will perish and their gathering be broken up and they will not again mislead [the] assembly and the simple [ones] 8 will no more sustain their counsel.[1]

And finally, in 4Qp Is^{c} 10 we have the fairly certain reconstruction:

10 The interpretation of the phrase, at the end of days, concerning the congregation of the s[eekers after] smooth things [d[wršy] hhlqwt) 11 who are in Jerusalem. . . .

Brownlee has suggested that in the word hălāqôt the writers of these documents were playing on the word for the legal interpretations (hălākôt) of the Pharisees who were constantly at pains to make the observance of the Torah easier (cf. Mk 7,9-13). The hălākôt are tauntingly branded as hălāqôt (smooth things).[2]

It is questionable whether hălāqôt and hălākôt sound alike to a Semite and therefore whether there is actually a pun

---

[1]The translations of 4Qp Nah 2 and 3 are from J. M. Allegro, "More Unpublished Pieces of a Qumran Commentary on Nahum (4Qp Nah)," Journal of Semitic Studies, 7 (1962), 304-308.

[2]William H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," The Biblical Archaeologist, 14 (1951), 59-60.

involved. But that the legal interpretations of the Pharisees are meant seems fairly certain. In the two passages from the hymns the phrase "seekers after smooth things" is in parallelism with false "interpreters," and the same identification seems to be made in CD 1,18-20. The lying interpreters who exchange God's Law for "smooth things" are mentioned in 1QH 4,10; and CD 1,18 and 1QH 2,14-15 clearly relate the expression "smooth things" to Is 30,10 and false religious teaching.[1] The identification of Demetrius in 4Qp Nah 1,2 is not certain, but it is perhaps Demetrius III[2] and those who gave counsel would be, as Josephus tells us, the Pharisees. At any rate 4Qp Is^{c} tells us that these "seekers after smooth things" are in Jerusalem.

The verb dāraš, then, is used here in the sense of "interpret" (cf. the parallelism in the hymns) and probably also with the double or triple meaning "interpret/look for/practice."

The three remaining texts in which our verb is to be taken in the meaning of "interpret" are the three occurrences of the phrase dwrš htwrh:

2 But God remembered the covenant of the forefathers and He

---

[1]Gaster, op. cit., p. 208, n. 13; A. Dupont-Sommer, "Le Livre des Hymnes découvert près de la mer Morte," Semitica, 7 (1957), 32, n. 5; Patrick W. Skehan, "Two Books on Qumrân Studies," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 21 (1959), 76.

[2]J. M. Allegro, "Further Light on the History of the Qumrân Sect," Journal of Biblical Literature, 75 (1956), 92; Millar Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: Viking, 1958), pp. 201-203; Cross, op. cit., pp. 91-94; Milik, Ten Years . . . , pp. 72-73.

raised up from Aaron men of understanding and from Israel 3 men of wisdom and He made them listen and they dug the well: "a well which princes dug, which 4 the nobles of the people delved with a staff [Num 21,18]." The well is the Law, and those who dug it are 5 the penitents of Israel who went out from the land of Judah and exiled themselves in the land of Damascus, 6 all of whom God called princes because they sought Him and 7 their glory has been told by the mouth of no man. And the staff/lawgiver is the interpreter of the Law [dwrš htwrh] of whom 8 Isaiah has said: "He brings forth a tool for His work [Is 54,16]." And the nobles of the people are those 9 who come to dig the well with the staves/rules which the staff/lawgiver gave, 10 and in which they are to walk during the whole period of wickedness; and other rules they shall not get until he arises who 11 shall teach righteousness at the end of days (CD 6,2-11).

12 . . . When the two houses of Israel separated 13 and Ephraim turned away from Judah, all the unfaithful were given over to the sword, but they who stood fast 14 escaped to the land of the north, as He has said: "I will exile Sikkûth, your king, 15 and Kiyyûn, your images, [the star, your god which you made for yourselves] from the tents of Damascus [Am 5,26-27]." The books of the Law are the tabernacle of [sukkat] 16 the king, as He said: "I will raise up the fallen tabernacle of [sukkat] David [Am 9.11]." The king 17 is the assembly, and the "kiyyûn, your images," are the books of the prophets 18 whose words Israel despised. And the star is the interpreter of the Law [dwrš htwrh] 19 who came [or, will come; or, comes] to Damascus, as it is written: "A star shall come out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise 20 from Israel [Num 24,17]." The sceptre is the prince of the whole congregation, and when he arises he shall smite 21 all the sons of Seth/pride (CD 7,12-21).

10 "And] the Lord [tel]ls you that He will build a house for you, and I shall set up your seed after you, and I shall establish his royal throne 11 [foreve]r. I [will be] to him a father and he will be to me a son." He is the shoot of David who will arise with the interpreter of the Law [dwrš htwrh] who 12 [. . . .] in Si[on ? in the l]ast days, as it is written: "And I shall raise up the fallen tabernacle of David." That is the tabernacle of 13 David that is fal[len and wh]ich will arise to save Israel (4Q Fl 1,10-13).

The problem of the identity of this "interpreter of the Law" and of the number of such "interpreters" involved has been

discussed at length elsewhere,[1] and we shall not restate it here. Conclusions at the present time can only be tentative, and actually the discussion has little bearing on the point under present consideration--the meaning of our verb in these passages.

CD 7,12-21 and 4Q Fl 1,10-13 give no information as to the activity of the dôrēš, but from CD 6,2-11 we see that the dôrēš was the instrument that God provided the sect to dig the well of the Law. The dôrēš produced rules or laws from the well and these are to serve as the norms for life "until he arises who shall teach righteousness at the end of days." Thus the natural acceptation of dôrēš here is "interpreter," and the same meaning is undoubtedly involved in the other two texts--whether the figure described there be the same individual as he came in the past, or the same individual who will come again at end-time, or a different eschatological dôrēš on the pattern of the first.

Three other occurrences of dāraš are fragmentary and do not admit of a reasonably certain translation: 1QH 17,6; 1Sb 3,20; 1Q29 5,2.

---

[1] Burrows, More Light . . . , pp. 312-41; Cross, op. cit., pp. 170-73; Milik, Ten Years . . . , pp. 123-27; J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumrân Literature," Journal of Biblical Literature, 75 (1956), 176-77; Raymond E. Brown, S.S., "The Messianism of Qumrân," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 19 (1957), 80-81; A. S. van der Woude, Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân (Assen: van Gorcum, 1957), pp. 38-61; 67-74; 172-75; N. Wieder, "The 'Law Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses," Journal of Jewish Studies, 4 (1953), 158-75; P. Winter, "Notes on Wieder's Observations on the dwrš htwrh in the Book of the New Covenanters of Damascus," Jewish Quarterly Review, 45 (1954-55), 39-47.

Midrāš in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The word mdrš has occurred eight times to date in the QL: CD 20,6; 1QS 6,24; 8,15.26; 4Q Fl 1,14; plus three occurrences reported by Milik from unpublished material from 4Q.[1]

The first occurrence is in the Manual of Discipline at the beginning of the section on the penal code:

> 24 And these are the ordinances by which they shall judge in community midrash (bmdrš yḥd) according to the cases: If there be found among them a man who shall have lied 25 in the matter of wealth, and this knowingly, they shall exclude him from the purification of the Many for one year and he shall be deprived of one-fourth of his food allowance, etc. (1QS 6,24-25).

Gaster and Wernberg-Møller understand mdrš here as the study or interpretation of the law: "These are the rules by which they shall be ruled by communal study according to the cases" (Wernberg-Møller); "And these are the rules to be followed in the interpretation of the law regarding forms of speech" (Gaster).[2] Both take the verb špṭ in the sense of "rule," but this is a meaning it does not have in QL or in post-Biblical Hebrew.[3] Therefore, it is a question of judging on the basis of ordinances here and not of a listing of norms for future interpretation; and thus it seems that the natural meaning of mdrš in

---

[1] "Le travail d'édition des manuscrits de Qumrân," Revue Biblique, 63 (1956), 61.

[2] Wernberg-Møller, op. cit., pp. 31, 110; Gaster, op. cit., p. 51.

[3] Cf. Jastrow, op. cit., p. 1614.

this context is "juridical investigation, scrutiny,"[1] and that reference is made to the judicial activity of the Many on cases concerning members as mentioned in 1QS 5,24; 6,1.9; 8,24. It is true that CD speaks of a particular body of judges (9,10; 10,1. 4ff.; 15,4) but it is generally held that 1QS and CD reflect different stages in the development of the sect.[2]

Schubert suggests that "Midrash Yaḥad" is the title of the following part of the sect's code of laws[3] but this results in an extremely awkward sentence. Milik suggests the possibility of mdrš referring to the place where cases are heard.[4] This would demand a special place, but the excavations at Qumrân indicate only one large meeting hall (on the ground level), and 1QS 6,8-10 seems to imply that all community business was handled in the same place. It appears best, therefore, to take mdrš as designating an activity as above rather than a locality.

The next occurrence of the noun is in 1QS 8,15:

---

[1]With Vermes, op. cit., p. 145; Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 379; Lambert, op. cit., p. 966; Milik, "Manuale . . . ," p. 146; Brownlee, Manual of Discipline, p. 26; Delcor, op. cit., p. 74.

[2]E.g., Wernberg-Møller, op. cit., p. 110; Cross, op. cit., p. 60.

[3]Kurt Schubert, "Die jüdischen und judenchristlichen Sekten im Lichte des Handschriftenfundes von 'en Feščha," Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 74 (1952), 50.

[4]Milik, "Manuale . . . ," p. 131.

> 12 When these men exist for the community 13 in Israel, these are the provisions by which they are to be separated from the midst of the assembly of the men of iniquity so that they may indeed go into the wilderness to prepare there the way of the Lord 14 as it is written: "In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God [Is 40,3]." 15 This alludes to the midrash of the Law [mdrš htwrh] [which] He commanded through Moses to do according to all that is revealed in each age 16 and according to what the prophets have revealed through His holy spirit (1QS 8,12-16).

Unfortunately the line mdrš htwrh ['šr] ṣwh byd mwšh l'śwt admits of several translations.

1. Reicke understands the relative as referring to mdrš and translates "the study . . . which He commanded . . . to do, . . ."[1]

2. Lambert, Burrows, and Gaster take the relative as referring to mdrš and understand the infinitive as an infinitive of purpose: "the study which He commanded, . . . in order that the Law might be done according to. . . ."[2]

3. Brownlee and Dupont-Sommer understand the relative as referring to "law" and the infinitive as an infinitive of purpose: "that means studying the Torah which He promulgated through Moses, so as to do it according to. . . ."[3]

4. Milik and Wernberg-Møller take the relative as

---

[1]Quoted in Wernberg-Møller, op. cit., p. 129.

[2]Lambert, op. cit., p. 969; Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 382; Gaster, op. cit., p. 56.

[3]Brownlee, Manual of Discipline, p. 32; Dupont-Sommer, Nouveaux aperçus . . . , p. 17.

referring to law and translate: "the law which He commanded through Moses to do."[1]

Reicke's translation fits in poorly with the rest of the sentence, and, as Wernberg-Møller points out, the verb 'śh always refers to the doing of the Law in 1QS.[2] Furthermore, as for both no. 1 and no. 2, it is highly unlikely that the relative refers to mdrš. The phrase 'šr swh yhwh, so common in the OT in connection with the Law, almost certainly refers to "Torah" here.

If, however, we choose no. 2, then the meaning of mdrš is clearly "study"--the reference being to Jos 1,8 (Joshua speaking instead of Moses). But if, as seems best, we choose no. 3 or no. 4, it would seem at first glance that either "study" or "interpretation" could render mdrš.[3] Here again, as in the discussion of drš in 1QS 6,6, we feel that "interpret" is much too narrow a meaning in the light of the whole context of the Qumrân sect. Mdrš is meant to signify in a general way the sectaries' activity in the desert--how they prepare the way of the Lord. Certainly, the working out of their own interpretations of the

---

[1]Milik, "Manuale . . . ," p. 150; Wernberg-Møller, op. cit., p. 34.

[2]Wernberg-Møller, op. cit., p. 129.

[3]Here, certainly the word could mean the "pursuit" of the Law or "searching" the Law. But since the combination drš htwrh in the verbal usages in the QL always involves the notion either of "study" or of "interpret," we feel justified in limiting the possibilities of the meaning of the noun to these two acceptations.

Scriptures was an important facet of life at Qumrân, but "interpreting" would not adequately describe the work of the community on the Torah. Rather, we are faced with a group which is dedicated to a complete return to the Law of Moses and to the study of the Law (1QS 6,6; 8,12; CD 5,4-9) in order to seek out the mysteries of God which are hidden from Israel (1QS 8,12), to be sure, but also to master it and teach it (1QS 6,6 in the light of Jos 1,8; 1QS 1,12; 5,24; 6,18; 9,13.17-21; CD 6,14.17-18; 13,7-8) so it might be kept in all its details.

Therefore, regardless of how one construes the sentence under discussion, it would seem that mdrš htwrh for the sectaries is the practical study of the Law, as well as study which is intended to find the secrets of God so as not to go astray.[1]

The noun occurs again in CD 20,6:

> 1 And such also is the judgment 2 for all those who have entered the congregation of the men of perfect holiness and who are loath to carry out the precepts of the just: 3 he is the man who is melted in the furnace. When his deeds become manifest, let him be sent away from the congregation 4 as one whose lot has not fallen among those taught by God. According to his sin shall the men of 5 knowledge reprove him until the day when he returns to stand in the assembly of the men of perfect holiness 6 and when his deeds become manifest according to the midrash of the Torah [mdrš htwrh] in which walk 7 the men of perfect holiness. (Until then) let no man have any business with him in matters of property or work, 8 for all the holy men of the Most High have cursed him (CD 20,1-8).[2]

---

[1]Thus Delcor, op. cit., pp. 66-69, and all the translators.

[2]We construe lines 5-7 with Gaster, op. cit., p. 72, and Chaim Rabin, The Zadokite Documents (2d ed. rev.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), p. 38.

Rabin sees here a juridical examination, "investigation according to the Law," similar to the expression dîn tôrâh of later usage.[1] However, it is not the Torah which prescribes the investigation but the rule of the community; nor does this phrase occur in line 3 where there is also investigation involved--because the phrase does not mean investigation but is connected with a norm of virtue.

The meaning of mdrš is clearly the "interpretation" of the Law in which walk the men of perfect holiness. As Delcor points out, mdrš seems to be the equivalent of prwš htwrh, expression peculiar to CD (4,8; 6,14; 13,6; cf. also 6,18.20; 14,18), and thus means the true explanation of the Torah proper to the sectaries and according to their methods.[2]

There is one other occurrence in the Manual of Discipline and it poses something of a problem.

> 8,24 . . . If he has sinned (against the Law of Moses) through inadvertence, he shall be excluded from the purification and from the consultation and they shall follow the rule: 25 he shall not judge a man or be asked for his counsel concerning any matter for two years (to see) if his way is perfect 26 in the assembly, in (the) midrash and in the council [bmwšb bmdrš wb'sh] [in the judgment of the Many],--if he does not sin again inadvertently by the completion of his two 27 years. 9,1 For on account of one inadvertent sin he shall be punished for two years, but as for the one who acts deliberately, he shall not come back again. Only he who sins inadvertently 2 will be tested for two years as to the

---

[1]Rabin, op. cit., p. 38.

[2]Delcor, op. cit., pp. 71, 74.

> perfection of his way and his counsel, according to the judgment of the Many, and after that he shall be enrolled in his rank in the holy community (1QS 8,24-9,2).[1]

Mdrš here apparently alludes either to the study of the Torah (6,6) or to the judicial scrutiny of 6,24--it is not clear which is the case.

In 1QS 6,22-23 we see that after two years of initiation, the new member is admitted "for Torah, and for mišpāṭ, and for purification, and for the sharing of his property and (from then on) the community will have his counsel and judgment." Thus he obtains the right to study Torah and mišpāṭ, to partake in the sacred ritual and to cast a deliberative and consultative vote.[2] This deliberative and consultative vote is cast in the assembly (mwšb) (1QS 6,8-9). The gentleman in question in the present passage apparently is to be excluded from the ritual and be deprived of his deliberative and consultative vote for two years. However, he will still attend the assembly (mwšb) and his conduct will be observed there (no doubt on such points as are found in 7,10ff.). This much appears to be fairly certain.

Now, it is possible that bmdrš wb'ṣh is to be understood as a specification of bmwšb since a conjunction is lacking between mwšb and mdrš, and since the 'ṣh is certainly a specifica-

---

[1] A difficult passage; thus construed with Lambert (op. cit., p. 970) and Habermann (op. cit., p. 68). It would seem that the space in l. 27 would indicate a sentence division, even though it does occur at the bottom of the column.

[2] Delcor, op. cit., p. 74.

tion of mwšb. The translation would then go: "in the assembly, during scrutiny and deliberation." Furthermore, in support of this interpretation, it could be pointed out that "Torah and mišpāṭ" are the designations for the specific "community exercise" of study (6,22), even though mdrš designates study of the Law in general.

This understanding of the passage is by no means certain, however. The lack of the conjunction need not be significant; one would think the community would observe the man in more places than in the assembly; and the terminology of the sect is far from uniform, so that Torah, while designating "study of the Torah" in 6,22, need not be the only such designation.

Dupont-Sommer translates: "if his conduct is perfect in assembly, upon investigation, and in the Council"--a possibility.[1]

We must conclude that the meaning here is in doubt, but we would incline to the acceptation "judicial scrutiny" with Lambert and Milik.[2]

A most interesting occurrence for our study is in line 14 of the fragment which Allegro has provisionally entitled 4Q Florilegium:

1,1 . . . and] a son of wickedness [shall no more afflict him] as at first, and as from the day that 2 [I commanded judges] to be over my people Israel--that is the house	2 Sam 7,10b-11a

---

[1]Dupont-Sommer, Nouveaux aperçus . . . , p. 122.

[2]Lambert, op. cit., p. 970; Milik, op. cit., p. 150.

which [he will make thee in the e]nd of
days, as it is written in the book of
3 [Moses: The sanctuary, O Lord, Ex 15,17-18
which] thy hands have [es]tablished.
The Lord will reign forever and ever.
That is the house where there shall not Dt 23,3.4
enter 4 [any one in whose flesh there
is a permanent blemish (?)] and the Am- Ez 44,9
monite and Moabite and bastard and ali-
en for ever and ever for his holy ones
are there. 5 The L[o]rd (?) [shall
rule (?) for] ever; he shall be seen
continually upon it, and strangers
shall not again make it desolate (or:
defile it) as they desolated formerly
6 the sanc[tuary of I]srael because
of their sins. And he purposed to
build for him a man-made sanctuary in
which sacrifices might be made to him;
7 (that there might be) before him
works of the Law. And what it/he says
to David: And I shall [give] thee 2 Sam 7,11b
[rest] from all thine enemies--(meaning)
that he will give rest to them from
a[ll] 8 the sons of Belial who made
them stumble in order to destroy them
[because of their sins (?)] when they
came (?) with the device of [Be]lial
to make the s[ons of 9 light (?)]
stumble and to devise against them
wicked plans [so that they will be
caught (?)] by Belial through their
va[in] error. 10 [And] the Lord 2 Sam 7,11c-14a
[tel]ls you that he will build a house
for you, and I shall set up your seed
after you, and I shall establish his
royal throne 11 [for eve]r. I [will
be] to him as a father, and he will be
to me as a son. He is the shoot of
David who will stand with the inter-
preter of the Law, who 12 [will rise
(?)] in Zi[on in the l]ast days as it
is written, And I shall raise up the Amos 9,11
tabernacle [sukkat] of David that is
fallen. That is the branch [sokat]
13 of David that is fa[llen and wh]ich
will arise to save Israel.
14 A mi[d]rash from Happy is the man Ps 1,1
that walketh not in the counsel of the
wicked. The interpretation [pšr] of

the passa[ge concerns] those who turn aside from the way of [the people (?)] 15 as it is written in the book of Isaiah the prophet concerning the last days: And it was as with a strong [hand that the Lord turned me aside from walking in the way of] 16 this people. And they are the ones of whom it is written in the book of Ezekiel the prophet [. . .] 17 their [i]do[l]s (?). They are the sons of Zadok and the men (?) of his coun[sel] (?), . . . to the counsel of (?) the community. 18 [Why do] the nations [rag]e and the peoples imag[ine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set] themselves [and the ru]lers take counsel together against the Lord and against 19 [his anointed. The in]terpretation [pšr] of the passage [concerns . . .] the elect of Israel in the last days. 2,1 That is the time of trial which is co[ming . . .] 2 Belial and there shall remain [. . .] 3 Moses, that is the [. . .] 3a and righteous ones [. . .][1]

Is 8,11

Ez 44,10 ? (37,23 ?)

Ps 2,1

An analysis of the fragment has been made by William R. Lane[2] who has rightly observed that (1) there is a major division in the text at the end of line 13 and the scroll is apparently a collection of two (or more) independent works with the conclusion of one and the beginning of another represented in the preserved fragments.[3] (2) Both are pᵉšārîm, the first on

---

[1]The translation is largely Allegro's ("Fragments of a Qumrân Scroll of Eschatological Midrāšîm," Journal of Biblical Literature, 77 (1958), 350-54). However, we have amended the translation in part in accord with some of the suggestions offered by Lou Silberman ("A Note on 4Q Florilegium," Journal of Biblical Literature, 78 (1959) and Yigael Yadin ("A Midrash on 2 Sam. vii and Ps. i-ii (4Q Florilegium)," Israel Exploration Journal, 9 [1959], 95-98).

[2]William R. Lane, "A New Commentary Structure in 4Q Florilegium," Journal of Biblical Literature, 78 (1959), 343-46.

[3]This observation he bases on content, style of exposition, the title: mdrš m- at the beginning of line 14, and the

2 Sam 7 and the second on the first lines of the Psalms. (3) Both are a complex type of pēšer using biblical citations at a secondary level to strengthen the author's exposition. (4) In the first there are three primary citations from Samuel, two introduced with no formula (1,1.10) and one with w'šr 'mr ldwyd (1,7). In the second there are two primary citations from the Psalms, introduced with no formula. (5) In the first the third personal pronoun is used as the introductory element for each interpretation, a usage found only in 4Qp Is^{b} 2,6-7.10.[1] The third personal pronoun is used in other pᵉšārîm only to introduce the interpretation of individual words picked out of the text for special consideration. The second composition in our fragments employs the expression pšr hdbr which is one of the standard formulae of the other pᵉšārîm from Qumrân. (6) The first introduces the secondary citations with k'šr ktwb (1,2.12),[2] a

---

space left at the end of line 13. As Lane remarks, there is also a space left at the end of line 9, but this manner of setting off certain biblical quotations by paragraphing is found also in 4Qp Hos^{b} and does not detract from the inference that the space in line 13 marks a real transition in the text.

It is possible that the fragment represents one midrash/pesher on the promises to David (in 2 Sam 7) and on David's psalms (1 and 2 . . .) but the style of exposition and the title at the beginning of line 14 would especially suggest two previously distinct works. The interest in David would have governed the selection.

[1]Lane explains away the ones in 4Qp Is^{b} 2,6-7 as a transitional device and not interpretation ("Pešer Style as a Reconstruction Tool in 4Q Pešer Isaiah B," Revue de Qumrân, 2 [1959-60], 281, n. 3) and inserts pšrw in line 10 ("A New Commentary Structure . . . ," p. 344, n. 7). The first is not convincing; the second is possible but by no means certain.

[2]The biblical material in lines 3-4 is an allusion and not a citation.

formula of introduction which is not employed in any other pēšer from Qumrân published to date but which is used in other works to introduce biblical citations as supporting arguments for the point being made by the author. The second work uses 'šr ktwb to introduce its secondary citations (1,15.16).

That this document is not testimonia or florilegium literature as Allegro supposes seems quite clear from the analysis above. Perhaps the first of the works is a use of testimonia literature as Fitzmyer provisionally suggests.[1] In any event, both works clearly are pešārîm manifesting the characteristics of that genre: the application of biblical material to the end of days by discovering with the help of revelation the secrets contained in the scriptures and then paraphrasing the Biblical text with no further attempt to elucidate. However, as we have said, the works are of a more complex type of pēšer utilizing additional biblical material on a secondary level, and this marks a difference in character from the other existing pēšer literature (except perhaps for 4Qp Is^{c} 13a where Os 6,9 is inserted between lines 13 and 14; however the use of the Osee text here is not clear due to the fragmentary nature of the document).

As for the word m[d]rš in line 14, the reading is certain since no letter other than daleth could be supplied that would make sense in the context. The meaning of the term seems

---

[1]Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J., "'4Q Testimonia' and the New Testament," Theological Studies, 18 (1957), 532.

to be generic: "an interpretation, exposition."

Without getting involved at this point in the controversy over whether a pēšer is midrash or commentary, we might observe that this occurrence in 4Q Fl lends some support to the position of those who opt for the title midrash in the generic sense (= "exegesis, interpretation") as a designation for the pᵉšārîm (Milik, van der Ploeg[1]). The evidence is of course limited, and the use of the word midrash may have been confined to this complex type of pēšer alone. But the possibility that midrash was used by Qumran as a title for all the Biblical commentaries and that pēšer designates the interpretation of a single text within a midrash, as van der Ploeg suggests,[2] is not to be dismissed out of hand. To date, however, we lack the initial words of each of the pᵉšārîm to verify this (except in the case of a possible pēšer on Is from 3Q which begins absolutely with Is 1,1--but the nature of this work is not clear[3]). The more fundamental question of the pēšer's affinity to rabbinic midrash is another matter and discussion of this will be reserved for chapter iii.

---

[1]J. T. Milik, "Fragments d'un midrash de Michée dans les manuscrits de Qumrân," Revue Biblique, 59 (1952), 413, n. 4; J. van der Ploeg, O.P., "Le rouleau d'Habacuc de la grotte de 'Ain Feša," Bibliotheca Orientalis, 8 (1951), 2; idem, "Les manuscrits du Désert de Juda. Livres récents," Bibliotheca Orientalis, 16 (1959), 163.

[2]van der Ploeg, "Les manuscrits . . . ," p. 163.

[3]R. de Vaux, "Exploration de la région de Qumrân," Revue Biblique, 60 (1953), 556.

Three additional occurrences of the word mdrš have been reported from the unpublished material of 4Q.[1]

Fragments of two MSS of the Manual of Discipline, dating from the beginning of the first century B.C., reveal a text differing little from 1QS, except for col. 5. Here the two MSS present a form that is shorter and more primitive than the one we already possessed and they furnish this reading for the first line of the column:

mdrš lmśkyl 'l 'nšy htwrh hmtndbym . . .

A midrash for the instructor concerning the men of the law who dedicate themselves, etc.[2]

in place of 1QS 5,1:

wzh hsrk l'nšy hyḥd hmtndbym . . .

This is the rule for the men of the community who dedicate themselves, etc.

The word mdrš appears to mean "an interpretation" (of the Torah) and is used as a title for the section. Apparently the material in the column is of the same character as that contained in the version we know from 1Q, i.e., a program of life for the community in more or less general terms based upon the

---

[1] J. T. Milik, "Le travail d'édition ... ," p. 61.

[2] The mśkyl is probably a specific person in the community (as seems to be the case in 1QS 3,13; 9,12.21 and perhaps also in CD 12,21; Hod 12,11; 1QSb 1,1; 3,13; 5,20). Jean Carmignac (La règle de la guerre [Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958], p. 1) translates this line "midrash of" and states that the lamed is clearly a lamed auctoris. This is a possibility but hardly a certainty.

sect's interpretation of the Torah. However, the precise contents of the column, its form, and above all its use of Scripture are not reported. It is interesting to note with regard to the latter, though, that of the three explicit citations of Scripture in 1QS (5,15.17; 8,13-14) two are in column 5. What role did these citations play in the earlier version? Were there other citations? These are important questions that will have to await the publication of the fragments to be answered. However, it seems clear that the title mdrš was not limited merely to the pesher form of scriptural interpretation but was also applied to a codified body of inferences from the Scriptures with some (as yet undetermined) dependence on explicit biblical citations.

Perhaps this section was at one time a separate composition subsequently worked into the Manual. In commenting on 1QS 3,13-4,26 (a section also beginning with lmśkyl), Gaster characterizes the segment under discussion as a kind of sermon and suggests that it was probably delivered as an exposition of the Scriptural Lesson, Dt 30,15ff.: "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil, etc."[1] If column 5 was an independently existing work, Gaster's suggestion for 1QS 3,13ff. might provide an interesting avenue of inquiry for our midrash when the actual text becomes available.

Two MSS of CD from 4Q preserve the last part of the work

---

[1]Gaster, op. cit., p. 95, n. 24.

and conclude:

whzh [sic] prwš hmšptym 'šr y'św bkwl qs [. . .]

of which the last words are

[. . .']l mdrš htwrh h'hrwn.

(Milik does not report the extent of the gap.)

> And this is the interpretation of the ordinances which they shall do during the whole time of . . . according to the definitive interpretation (or exposition) of the Torah.

Mdrš here is clearly "interpretation/exposition."

There is also a MS from 4Q in cryptic script A which preserves on the back of one fragment (probably of the last column of the work) the title in square letters:

mdrš spr mwšh

Interpretation/exposition of the Book of Moses

Again we have an example of mdrš used as a title, but unfortunately Milik gives no indication of the nature of the work. Cross remarks that the contents of the cryptic documents belong to well-known categories of literature at Qumrân,[1] but whether this midrash is similar to the pēšer literature or to the Genesis Apocryphon has not yet been announced.

Drš and Mdrš in the Rabbinic Literature

It would be desirable if the word study could be continued into the rabbinic literature,[2] but here we are faced with a prac-

---

[1]Cross, op. cit., p. 36.

[2]Here and elsewhere in the text the term "rabbinic" will

tical impossibility due to a lack of tools. There is a concordance to the Mishna by Kassovsky but there is nothing that covers the remainder of the literature. Moreover, for many of the rabbinic works there are no critical texts or even good texts. However, the term midrash is a prominent one in the literature of Judaism, and the brief studies of drš and mdrš which have been done[1] and the conclusions of which we will restate here will be accurate enough for our purposes.

In the rabbinic literature the verb dāraš lost most of the above meanings, retaining only the acceptations: "examine, question, study, interpret," and took on the meanings: "teach, learn, lecture, preach." At first the verb was used largely in connection with Scripture, but later its use to designate other intellectual work was gradually expanded.[2]

---

be used to designate the Talmudic and Midrashic literature, and "the Rabbis" to denote the scholars responsible for that literature in the Tannaitic, Amoraic, and later periods, despite the fact that the terms "rabbi" and "rabbinic" are not strictly applicable to that part of the Tannaitic period prior to the fall of the Temple.

[1]Bacher, op. cit., I, 25-28; 34-36; 42-43; 103-05; 117-21; 201-02; II, 41-43; 53-56; 107; 119-20; 173; idem, "The Origin of the word Haggada (Agada)," Jewish Quarterly Review, 4 (1892), 406-29; W. Bacher, "Les trois branches de la science de la vieille tradition juive," Revue des Études Juives, 38 (1899), 211-219; Jastrow, op. cit., pp. 325-26, 735; Levy, op. cit., I, 428-29; II, 34-5; E. Margulies [hb. mrglywt!], "The Term drš in Talmud and Midrash [Heb]," Lešônênû, 20 (1956), 50-61; Heinemann, art. cit.

[2]The verb also developed a Hithpa'el. From the verb two nouns were derived: dᵉrāšâ: "interpretation," and daršān, "interpreter, lecturer, lawyer." As mentioned in the section on

In its meaning, "interpret," the verb signified the whole of Tannaitic and Amoraic exegesis: both the abundance of correct explanations in harmony with the wording and the context, and the even larger mass of interpretations far removed from the actual meaning of the text. During the Tannaitic period there was as yet no word to signify the latter type of exegesis, but several terms were used to designate the former, literal exegesis: e.g., kᵉmišmā'ô and wadda'y. It was the Babylonian Amoraim who were the first to use the Aramaic nouns pᵉšaṭ and dᵉraš to designate the literal sense and free rabbinic interpretation respectively. From then on, the Hebrew and Aramaic nouns dᵉrāšâ and dᵉraš came to be used more and more frequently to designate this free, homiletic exposition which sought to go more deeply than the literal sense and to draw out the hidden meanings of the Scriptures, and in time even the Hebrew and Aramaic verbs became colored by this usage.

The noun midrāš in the rabbinic literature up to the third century A.D. meant (1) "study, inquiry"; (2) the interpretation of Scripture, both the activity, and the result: the single interpretative statement (pl. midrāšôt); (3) a collection

---

etymology, the Jewish Aramaic root drš had the same meanings as the Hebrew root and the same derivatives, including midrāšā', all of them probably loan words. It is interesting to note in this connection, however, that the technical meaning assigned to drš by the Amoraim (cf. the discussion below) originated in the Aramaic and from there passed to the Hebrew.

of such interpretations (pl. midrāšîm). (4) The term midrāš was also used as a technical theological term to designate a branch of Jewish oral tradition. The whole of oral tradition was called Mishnah (in the broad sense) and within Mishnah most rabbis distinguished three objects and activities of study:

a) Midrash--the interpretation of the Bible, especially legislative portions of the Pentateuch

b) Halakah (or Halakoth or Mishnah [in the restricted sense]) --the systematic and topical assembling of halakic (legal) statements extracted from the Midrash and presented without their Biblical proof-texts.

c) Haggadah (or Haggadoth)--non-legal Biblical interpretation.

Sometimes in an enumeration of all the parts of the oral tradition the term Haggadah is omitted and the term Midrash then designates haggadic interpretation of Scripture as well as halakic. Sometimes, also, Midrash was used interchangeably with the term talmûd. Talmûd (in the period before it became the name of a literary work) had for one of its meanings "the exegetical discussion and proving of halakic statements." In this usage the term talmûd was close to the term Midrash in the tripartite division above and was sometimes used in place of it. Talmûd and Midrash were not exactly synonomous, however, and when they were used in opposition to each other a difference in meaning appeared: talmûd starts from the halakic statement and seeks to find a Biblical foundation or motivation for it, while Midrash takes its departure from the Biblical text and argues to a halakic statement.[1]

---

[1]Bacher, Terminologie, I, 201.

In this fourth sense, then, the word midrash was not a technical literary term but a technical theological term based on a literary characteristic (the fact that the works so named were so structured that their discussions took their departure from Scripture and were not structured topically or according to some other plan).

In the post-Amoraic period the word midrāš retained the above usages and at some point between then and now--probably the middle ages--it also came to designate the dᵉraš type of exegesis and was used to set off the earlier homiletic from the later scientific exposition. In this period also, the term haggadah gradually came to include more than non-legal Biblical interpretation and designated such things as folk-lore, sayings of the rabbis, fables, geography, medicine, astronomy, etc.[1] The word haggadah had earlier been used interchangeably with the term midrash (when haggadah had meant only Biblical interpretation),

---

[1] Hamburger Realencyclopädie des Judentums (Neustrelitz: 1896), II, 19.--From this period on Jewish oral tradition could be divided in two ways, one according to content and the other according to form. According to content the oral tradition falls into halakah (legal) and haggadah (non-legal) material. The halakah is transmitted in two forms: Midrash in which a text of Scripture is interpreted and the law derived from it is given, or Mishna which is a codification of laws presented independently of the scriptural bases. The haggadah is either interpretative (presented as exposition of Scripture--midrash) or free (legends, proverbs, etc. having no connection with the Scriptures and presented independently of Scripture). According to form, oral tradition falls into Midrash, Mishna, and free haggadah. The Midrash embraces haggadic and halakic interpretation of the Scriptures. Mishna is the codification of independent halakic statements. Free haggadah is non-interpretative haggadic material.

and it is apparently for this reason that occasionally, but not frequently, in this later period the same interchange is still made, so that as a result about one to two percent of the works called midrash have no connection with Scripture but contain merely rabbinic sayings, folk-lore, etc.[1]

Modern Usage of the Term Midrash

The term midrash is used by the Jews in modern Hebrew, and in other languages as a loan word, in the same manner as the word was used in the rabbinic material.

Among Biblical scholars today the term midrash has become a technical literary term to designate a literary genre. This is a modern usage of the word and is based on the rabbinic term midrash. The word is employed to designate that type of

---

[1]For example in A. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrasch (2d ed.; Jerusalem: Bamberger and Wahrmann, 1938) one finds the Midrash Maase Tora (II, 92-101) and the Midrash Leolam (III, 109-120) which are really collections of sayings of the rabbis. One also finds various forms of the Alphabet Midrash of Rabbi Akiba (III, 12-49; 50-64, etc.), a discussion of the significance and use of each letter of the alphabet. (It is pointed out in the midrash that these letters are the ones God used to write the Scriptures and perhaps that was the reason the work received the title of midrash. It would not be as far-fetched to the rabbinic mentality as it would be to ours.) There are also assorted versions of the deuterocanonical book of Judith. Some are simply entitled The Story of Judith (I, 130-131; II, 12-22) but others are entitled Midrash for Hanukkah (I, 132-136). The reason for the title midrash is not clear. Perhaps it is simply an example of midrash being used to designate free haggadah. Perhaps it was felt that the reworking of a revered but non-canonical work of antiquity could be called a midrash as well as the reworking of a Biblical text. Perhaps its use as a homily (normally being on the Bible and therefore a midrash) for the feast of Hanukkah was the influencing factor.--For a German translation of the Hebrew texts in Jellinek see A. Wünsche, Aus Israels Lehrhallen (Leipzig: Pfeiffer,

literature called midrash by the rabbis as well as other material judged to manifest the same characteristics. However, as was pointed out in the introduction, there is not much agreement among exegetes on what exactly is called midrash by the rabbis or on the characteristics of midrash; and another reason why this is so is now evident: the Jews themselves have not always been precise in their own use of the term midrash.

Conclusions

At this point the following conclusions may be drawn:

1) The term midrash as used among Biblical scholars today is intended as a title for a literary form. The implication in this literary usage is that the word is based, not on the rabbinic usage of midrash to designate the activity of study or of Biblical interpretation or a type of exegesis, but on the rabbinic usage which designates a specific corpus of literature within Jewish oral tradition. This distinction has not always been borne in mind in recent discussions of the literary form midrash, the word midrash being used within the same discussion to designate Biblical study and a type of exegesis as well as a literary classification as if all were synonymous. And clearly all are not synonymous. There is exegesis of the d^{e}rash type in the Talmud and yet the Talmud is not called a midrash by the

---

1907-1910). For the rarity of midrash as title for non-exegetical works see B. Heller, "Agadische Literatur," Encyclopaedia Judaica, I (Berlin: Verlag Eschkol, 1928), 979-1036; Strack, op. cit.

rabbis; and the study of the Bible (midrash) produced all three branches of oral tradition, yet all are not called midrash.

2) The corpus of literature designated by the rabbis as midrash has an undisputed claim to the modern technical literary term midrash. By convention it has been set up as the exemplar and if any pre-rabbinic works are to be classified in the same category, they must manifest the same primary characteristics.

3) What is the extent of this corpus of literature that is the exemplar and which must be analyzed for its primary characteristics? Is it just the material dealing with the Scriptures, or is it also the folklore, etc., of the later haggadah since an occasional work of this sort is entitled midrash? The only sound conclusion from the above data is that the modern technical term (a term intended to be precise) should be limited to the proper meaning of the rabbinic term, and midrash when properly used by the rabbis designated works dealing with Scripture. First of all, when the word midrash is used by the rabbis with some precision, i.e., when it is deliberately contrasted with another word, it very clearly means that traditional literature whose structure is such that it starts with a text of Scripture and comments on it. Midrash means this when it is used in opposition to talmud (see above) and also when it is set off against the word halakah (halakot), e.g., in the triple division midrash, halakot, haggadot, and also in the famous controversy between R. Meir and R. Jehuda over what Mishnah (in the restricted sense)

meant: R. Meir answered halakot and R. Jehuda answered midrash.[1] Secondly, this meaning of midrash is the meaning in the vast majority of its occurrences as titles of works and only in a few cases do we find the word applied to non-exegetical material. It would seem legitimate to conclude that the latter usage is an improper one, occasioned by the broadening of the term haggadah with which midrash had once been interchangeable. Thirdly, the fact that many Jews writing today distinguish between interpretative haggadah (midrash) and (free) haggadah (folklore, etc.) would seem to reinforce the position that the Hebrew word midrash, when properly used, designates only that literature which explains and interprets Scripture. We shall therefore take only that literature which falls under this proper rabbinic meaning as the exemplar for the modern technical term, and try in the next chapter to delineate its primary characteristics.

4) Some works written prior to the rabbinic material bear the title "midrash" (in Chr and the DSS), but one cannot automatically apply to them the modern technical term midrash solely on that account. As best we can tell at the moment from the small number of occurrences extant, the pre-rabbinic word midrash seems to be nothing more than a generic term with a variety of meanings and has not yet taken on the technical meaning found later among the rabbis. If we are to include pre-

---

[1] Kiddushin 49a.

rabbinic literary pieces under our modern category of midrash, we should do so only on the grounds that they possess the primary characteristics of midrash as found in the rabbinic works.

CHAPTER II

THE PRIMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF HAGGADIC MIDRASH IN THE RABBINIC MIDRASHIM

In this chapter we shall attempt to delineate the primary characteristics of haggadic midrash as found in the exemplar of our literary form, the Midrashim of the second to the thirteenth century A.D. We shall first of all discuss the major characteristics of this literature under three headings: the historical background of the Midrashim, their literary structure, and their exegetical method. We shall then attempt at the end of the chapter to sift the primary from the secondary characteristics and thus arrive at a definition of midrash. On the basis of these conclusions we will then in chapter iii go back into the pre-rabbinic literature and isolate earlier examples of this literary form.

Historical Background of the Midrashim[1]

The distinctive characteristic of postexilic Judaism was the great importance accorded to the Torah. This was not the

---

[1]For the historical background of the Midrashim cf. John Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), pp. 369-86; 413-28; Meyer Waxman, A History of

introduction of a new element into Israel's faith, but a new emphasis, a greater stress on a feature that had always been of central importance. The exile had naturally resulted in a heightened interest in the Torah. The Torah was the only sacred possession which was left to the Jews in Babylon, nation and cult having vanished. Furthermore, the prophets had explained the calamity of the exile as a penalty for sinning against Yahweh's Law and it is not at all surprising that the Jews felt that the future must be marked by a greater fidelity to the Law's demands. And thus, after the return from the exile and especially from the time of Ezra's reform the Law actually became the organizing principle of the community of the restoration. Moreover, very soon after the return, the living prophetic word had ceased,

---

Jewish Literature (reprint of 2d ed. of 1938; New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1960), I, 45-118; 136-50; Jacob Z. Lauterbach, Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933-35), I, xiii-xxviii; Hermann L. Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash (reprint of the Eng. translation of the revised 5th German edition; New York: Meridian Books, 1959), pp. 8-25; 201-32; I. Epstein, "Foreword," Midrash Rabbah, eds. H. Freedman and Maurice Simon (London: Soncino Press, 1939), I, ix-xxiii; George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-30), I, 3-173; S. Horovitz, "Midrash," The Jewish Encyclopedia, 8 (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1904), 548-50; J. Theodor, "Midrash Haggadah," The Jewish Encyclopedia, 8 (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1904), 550-52; W. Bacher, "Bible Exegesis--Jewish," The Jewish Encyclopedia, 3 (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1902), 162-65; Michael Guttmann, "Agada," Encyclopaedia Judaica, 1 (Berlin: Verlag Eschkol A.-G., 1928), cols. 951-72; Renée Bloch, "Écriture et tradition dans le Judaïsme: Aperçus sur l'origine du midrash," Cahiers Sioniens, 8 (1954), 9-34; id., "Midrash," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, 5 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1957), cols. 1267-69; L. Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden (2d edition by N. Brüll; Frankfurt: J. Kauffmann, 1892).

and thenceforth if anyone was to seek God, inquire of God, determine His will, he must of necessity seek in the Torah.

This emphasis on the Torah led to the final redaction of the Pentateuch, and this literary activity created in the succeeding centuries a favorable milieu for the final redaction, composition, and canonization of the remaining books of the OT and for the gradual fixing of the text.

Partly as a result of the exaltation of the Torah and the emergence of a more or less fixed text of the Pentateuch, partly because of the inaccessability of the Temple worship to all, there was gradually introduced into Jewish life the public reading and teaching of the Torah (and later of the Prophets and Writings as well). This new form of public worship existed alongside of the Temple cult and by the Hellenistic era had developed into the synagogue service properly speaking.

When the teachers began to read and teach the Torah to the people there was immediately revealed the rift between life as found in the Pentateuch and life as it was lived. Life is always ahead of the written law, there being added in the course of time many different customs, practices, and precepts to meet the needs of a developed and extended society and to specify general laws. And thus there was found the need for interpretation of the legal portions of the Torah to bridge the gap between past and present by justifying existing practices and developing new laws or new interpretations of old laws (halakah).

Likewise the nonlegal portions of the Torah and the rest of the Scriptures (Torah in the wider sense) required interpretation for they had become the primary source of ethical and inspirational teaching; and just as the full meaning and correct application of the legal material of the Torah was searched out, so also the full meaning of the historical records and of the prophecies and the ethical lessons to be derived from the stories of the fathers were drawn out of the Scriptures and applied to the needs of the present (haggadah). And with the destruction of the Temple and the intensifying of persecution an increased demand was made upon the haggadah--namely to supply comfort to the downtrodden and inspire them with hope. This interpretation of the Bible had to be strained to its utmost to provide spiritual food for the people and in time the haggadah absorbed all sorts of elements such as stories, proverbs, allegories, bits of metaphysics, and even science.

This interpretative activity, first mentioned in connection with Ezra's memorable convocation (Neh 8,7-8) and continued by the teachers of subsequent generations, resulted in an accumulation of a body of traditional legislation as well as explanations and comments on the written Scriptures. Oral at first, this material was later collected and committed to writing. Laws were codified according to subject, generally independently of their Scriptural backing, in collections such as the Mishna of Rabbi Judah; the interpretative material was compiled in other

works among which are the collections of the second to the thirteenth century, A.D. that have come down to us, in most cases by way of later redactions, and are known as the Midrashim.

By the end of the fifth century A.D. (or according to a more recent view, the end of the second century A.D.[1]) creative interpretative activity had virtually ceased. Thereafter the tendency was toward elaboration, codification, and compilation until the thirteenth century when, after a gradual process, the midrash was completely superseded by the more modern sciences: history, theology, grammatical exposition, and the counterpart of science, Kabalah.

Lists of the extant Midrashim with a description of their contents, approximate dates of composition and redactions, etc. can be found elsewhere,[2] and we will not restate this information here. Let us only say that the Midrashim are usually classified as either halakic or haggadic depending upon the nature of their content. However, while the haggadic Midrashim contain purely nonlegal material, the halakic are often a mixture of both halakah and haggadah. Therefore in our discussion of haggadic

---

[1]Geza Vermes, Scripture and Tradition in Judaism (Leiden: Brill, 1961), pp. 228-29.

[2]For those Midrashim containing haggadic material, cf. J. Theodor, art. cit., pp. 554-80; B. Heller, "Agadische Literatur," Encyclopaedia Judaica, 1 (Berlin: Verlag Eschkol A.-G., 1928), cols. 979-1036; Strack, op. cit., pp. 206-34; Zunz, op. cit.

midrash, especially in the section on method, we will from time to time cite examples from haggadic portions of the halakic Midrashim.

As can be seen from the foregoing remarks, the Midrashim contain material from many different periods. In general it can be said that many of the interpretations date from before the second century A.D. (even if they are found in works compiled in the Middle Ages); some interpretations are contemporaneous with the first compiler; some may even date from the periods of later redactors. Many of the interpretations are attributed (perhaps correctly) to specific rabbis, but this gives us merely a terminus ad quem, since the Rabbi may have been merely repeating an earlier interpretation; many are presented anonymously, for some of which a terminus a quo can be established on the basis of historical allusions. However, the precise dating of any specific interpretation is exceedingly difficult if not in some cases impossible to ascertain.[1]

In our discussion of the Midrashim, then, we will treat the literature as a unit. We run the risk of oversimplification, it is true, but the present writer feels that in a study like this, which is concerned with the general characteristics of the literature, such a procedure is justified (especially in view of the traditional nature of the material and in view of the basically

---

[1] For a discussion of this problem see Bernard J. Bamberger, "The Dating of Haggadic Materials," Journal of Biblical Literature, 68 (1949), 115-23.

constant approach to the OT common to both early and later Rabbinic commentators[1]). In any event, in the present stage of midrashic studies in which so little dating of strata has been done it is impossible to approach the subject otherwise.

Structure of the Haggadic Midrashim

The primitive Sitz im Leben therefore of the halakah was the discussions of the rabbinical schools, and the Sitz im Leben of the haggadah (and of the popular halakah) was the preaching which followed the Biblical reading in the cultic assemblies on Sabbaths and festivals, and the preaching on important public and private occasions (war, famine; circumcision, weddings, funerals, etc.). The haggadic Midrashim, which, as we have already said, are compilation works, are therefore collections of material culled directly or indirectly from these sermons, and in discussing the general structure of the Midrashim we must always remember that we are dealing largely with artificial structures.

From the point of view of literary structure, the haggadic Midrashim can be classified under three headings: (1) exegetical Midrashim; (2) homiletic Midrashim; (3) and narrative Midrashim.

1) Exegetical Midrashim: When the scholars undertook to edit, revise, and collect the immense body of haggadic material,

---

[1] J. Weingreen, "The Rabbinic Approach to the Study of the Old Testament," Bulletin of John Rylands Library, 34 (1951-52), 166.

one form that suggested itself was to arrange individual haggadic interpretations in textual sequence and thus to construct a verse-by-verse exposition of the individual books of the Bible (although in many cases all the verses are not provided with interpretation, especially in the latter chapters of books and in the Psalms). Various long and short explanations of successive passages were strung together and to this running commentary were added at times longer haggadic disquisitions and narratives connected in some way with the verse in question or with one of the explanations. Often in these interpretations references are made to other scriptural passages and the text being commented upon is considered in the light of the later citations. There are also references to circumstances and historical events contemporary with the original haggadist--it being characteristic of the midrash to view the personages and conditions of the Bible in the light of contemporary history. We cite a few examples from Bereshith Rabbah:

> AND IT CAME TO PASS, AS THEY JOURNEYED FROM THE EAST (MIKKEDEM) (Gn 11,2). They travelled from further east to nearer east. R. Leazar b. R. Simeon interpreted: They betook themselves away from the Ancient (kadmon) of the world, saying, "We refuse to accept either Him or His Divinity."
> THAT THEY FOUND A PLAIN. R. Judah said: All the nations of the world assembled to discover which plain would hold them all, and eventually they found it. R. Nehemiah observed: THEY FOUND: thus it is written, If it concerneth the scorners, He permits them to scorn (Jb 3,34).[1]

---

[1] I.e., God gives all men the opportunity to follow their desires, whether good or bad. Thus here, too, God permitted them to find a spot suitable for their purposes.

AND THEY DWELT THERE. R. Isaac said: Wherever you find dwelling mentioned, Satan becomes active.[1] R. Helbo said: Wherever you find contentment, Satan brings accusations.[2] R. Levi said: Wherever you find eating and drinking, the arch-robber [Satan] cuts his capers [is up to mischief].[3] AND THEY SAID TO ONE ANOTHER (Gn 11,3). Who said to whom? Said R. Berekiah: Mizraim said to Cush.[4] COME, LET US MAKE BRICKS, AND BURN THEM (WE-NISREFAH) THOROUGHLY: This is written wenissorfah (and we will be burnt): this people is destined to be burnt out of the world. AND THEY HAD BRICK FOR STONE, etc. R. Huna said: Their work prospered: a man came to lay one [stone] and he laid two; he came to plaster one [row] and plastered two.[5] AND THEY SAID: COME, LET US BUILD A CITY, AND A TOWER (Gn 11,4). R. Judan said: The tower they built, but they did not build the city. An objection is raised: But it is written, And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower (ib. 5)? Read what follows, he replied: And they left off to build the city (ib. 8), the tower, however, not being mentioned. R. Hiyya b. Abba said: A third of this tower which they built sank [into the earth], a third was burnt, while a third is still standing. And should you think that it [the remaining third] is small--R. Huna said in R. Idi's name: When one ascends to the top, he sees the palm trees below him like grasshoppers. AND LET US MAKE A NAME (SHEM). The School of R. Ishmael taught: SHEM (A NAME) means naught else but an idol.[6] AND SURELY (WE-AK) YOUR BLOOD OF YOUR LIVES WILL I REQUIRE (Gn 9,5). This includes one who strangles himself. You might think that even one in the plight of Saul is meant:

---

[1]By yšb the Rabbis understood "to live in tranquility," something which rouses Satan's ire.

[2]So as to disturb it.

[3]R. Levi translates: AND THEY SAT DOWN THERE--to eat and drink.

[4]Cf. Gn 10,6.

[5]The work seemed to grow of itself. He translates: And the brick turned itself for them into stone, etc.

[6]Bereshith Rabbah 38,7. (The translations are from Freedman and Simon, Midrash Rabbah [op. cit.].)

therefore we have AK.[1] You might think, even one like Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah: therefore, we have AK. AT THE HAND OF EVERY BEAST WILL I REQUIRE IT: this refers to the four kingdoms.[2] AT THE HAND OF MAN (HA-ADAM): R. Levi said: That means: from the hand of Edom.[3] EVEN AT THE HAND OF EVERY MAN'S BROTHER, as it is written, Deliver me, I pray Thee, from the hand of my brother, from the hand of Esau (Gn 32,12). WILL I REQUIRE THE LIFE OF MAN: this refers to Israel, as it is written, And ye My sheep, the sheep of My pasture, are men (Ez 34,31).[4]

I WILL MAKE HIM A HELP ('EZER) AGAINST HIM (KE-NEGDO) (Gn 2,8): if he is fortunate, she is a help; if not she is against him. R. Joshua b. Nehemiah said: If a man is fortunate, she is like the wife of Ḥananiah b. Ḥakinai; if not, she is like the wife of R. Jose the Galilean. R. Jose the Galilean had a bad wife; she was his sister's daughter, and used to put him to shame. His disciples said to him: "Master, divorce this woman, for she does not act as benefits your honour." "Her dowry is too great for me, and I cannot afford to divorce her," was his reply. Now it happened once that he and R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah were sitting and studying, and when they finished, the latter asked him, "Sir, will you kindly permit that we go to your home together?" "Yes," replied he. As they entered, she cast down her gaze [in anger] and was making her way out, when he looked at a pot standing on the pot-range and asked her, "Is there anything in the pot?" "There's a hash in it," she answered. He went and uncovered it, and found in it some chickens. Now R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah knew what he had heard, and as they sat together and were eating he observed, "Sir, did she not say it was hash, yet we have found chickens?" "A miracle has happened," replied he. When they finished he said to him: "Master, abandon this woman, for she does not treat you with proper respect." "Sir," he replied, "her dowry is too great for me and I cannot divorce her." "We [your pupils]," said the other, "will apportion her dowry among ourselves, so you can divorce her." And they did so, etc. etc.[5]

---

[1]It is a principle of exegesis that ak and raq (excepting, save that) are limiting particles.

[2]Viz., Babylonia, Persia, Greece, and Rome, with whom the "four beasts" mentioned in Dn 7,3.17 were identified.

[3]Reading this instead of Adam. Edom and Esau stand for Rome.

[4]Bereshith Rabbah 34,13. [5]Ibid., 17,3.

In the Midrash Tehillim a fairly uniform pattern is found throughout. Generally the sections begin with a quotation from a Psalm. The quotation is usually considered in the light of a citation from another passage of Scripture which in wording or in thought appears to be related to it.

> [A PSALM] OF DAVID. UNTO THEE, O LORD, DO I LIFT UP MY SOUL (Ps 25,1). These words are to be considered in the light of the verse In the same day thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it; for he is poor, and he lifteth his soul unto him (Dt 24,15). The Holy One, blessed be He, asked David: "David, why does thou lift up thy soul unto Me?" David replied: Because upon Thine earth I am a hireling before Thee: A servant that eagerly longeth for the shadow, and . . . a hireling that looketh for the reward of his work (Jb 7,2). And it is written of a hireling in the Law of Moses In the same day thou shalt give him his hire. And so Unto Thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul. For in the world's use the hireling who completes his work for a householder asks the householder for the wage of his work, and the householder gives it to him. And shall it not be so with the Holy One, blessed be He? Shall not the words neither shall the sun go down upon [a man's hire] apply also to the Holy One, blessed be He? Now if it is said of a hireling who asks the wage which the householder owes him, He lifteth his soul unto him, how much more ought this be said of us whose lives depend on Thee![1]

Often one or two or more interpretations of the secondary citation follow it, the last of which is intended to illumine, amplify, or explain the original quotation from the Psalm.

> FOR THE LEADER. MASCHIL OF DAVID; WHEN DOEG CAME AND TOLD SAUL: "DAVID IS COME TO THE HOUSE OF AHIMELECH" (Ps 52,1). These words are to be read in the light of the verse Suffer not thy mouth to bring thy flesh into guilt (Eccl 5,5). R. Joshua ben Levi said: This verse speaks of men who pledge charity. Suffer not thy mouth to promise rashly that that

---

[1] Midrash Tehillim 25,1. (The Translations are from William G. Braude, The Midrash on Psalms ("Yale Judaica Series: Vol. 13"; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959).

thou wilt give, and then, not give. Neither say thou before the messenger: that is, to the public messenger who comes and says to thee: "Give what thou didst pledge," say not, "It was an error: I knew not what I said." Wherefore should God be angry at thy voice, with which thou didst proclaim that thou wouldst give, yet gavest not? And destroy the work of thy hands: the few former deeds of charity which were to thy credit, them thou dost destroy. Another comment on Suffer not thy mouth to bring thy flesh into guilt. R. Benjamin said: This verse refers to pretenders to learning, etc. . . .
The Rabbis say: The words Suffer not thy mouth to bring thy flesh into guilt are addressed to Miriam. As soon as she spoke against Moses she became leprous, etc. . . .
A different comment: Suffer not thy mouth to bring thy flesh into guilt refers to slander, for with their mouths men make their flesh suffer guilt; because of what they let escape from their mouths, they are smitten with leprosy. . . . Who was such a slanderer? Doeg. When he slandered David, he became leprous, for it is said God will likewise break thee forever . . . and root thee out of the land of the living forever (Ps 52,7). What else can He will break thee mean except that Doeg became leprous, just as it is said of a leprous house, He shall break the house (Lv 14,45). And what caused his leprosy? The cause of it was that he slandered David, as is said When Doeg the Edomite came and told Saul, and said unto him: "David is come to the house of Ahimelech."[1]

The Tannaitic Midrashim (generally classified as halakic but containing haggadic material: Mekilta, Sifre, Sifra, etc.) follow the exegetical form throughout. However, many of the later haggadic Midrashim differ in this that the several "parashiyyot" (sections, chapters) are introducted by proems such as always characterize the beginnings of homilies collected in the homiletic midrashim (see below). Thus they are a combination of running commentary and homily. There are also minor haggadic works that use the exegetical format but treat of selected passages of

---

[1] Midrash Tehillim 52,1.

Scripture rather than of entire books of the Bible. There are even some midrashic works that are completely haggadah but they take their departure from a single Biblical text and thus so present the material that it is in the service of the Bible; e.g., the Midrash 'Elle Ezkerah which describes the execution of ten noted Tannaim but in connection with Ps 42,5.

In none of these exegetical compilations was an attempt made to reproduce in full the contents of these sermons. The Midrashim merely record in an abbreviated form the central ideas from which flowed the whole process of thought of the preachers and around which they wove their homilies. This accounts for the style of these collections being laconic, pithy, and terse at times to the point of obscurity, so that the reader feels that he is faced with a kind of super-shorthand. As William Braude has remarked, "the world of Midrash may thus be described as a garden of dried flowers. And at times only a combination of love, reverence, and learning can breathe life into leaves and blossoms which to a hasty and unsympathetic eye appear to be dead."[1]

2) Homiletic Midrashim:[2] Not all of the midrashic works break up the haggadic material at their disposal and arrange it in textual sequence. Some of the compilations--the homiletic

---

[1]William G. Braude, op. cit., I, xx.

[2]J. Theodor, art. cit., pp. 552-54; Strack, op. cit., pp. 204-205.

Midrashim--reproduce entire homilies, or abstracts, sections and revisions of homilies. The homiletic Midrashim therefore contain more extended discussions of texts than the exegetical Midrashim, but on the other hand present exegetical material only for selected verses of the Bible, usually the verses that form the beginnings of the Scripture readings in the synagogues.

The Scripture readings are either Pentateuchal pericopes according to the triennial Palestinian cycle which divides the Pentateuch into 154-175 Sedarim, or Pentateuchal and prophetic pericopes according to the Pesikta cycle for festivals and special Sabbaths. Both "Sedarim and Pesikta homilies" are found in the extant Midrashim.

Each homily begins with one or more proems, introductions based upon some Biblical text. The proems lead into the exposition proper which, however, covers only a few of the first verses of the Scripture lesson, the first verse (or the first part of the first verse) of the lesson usually being discussed more fully than the other verses. The homilies generally close with Messianic or consolatory passages on the future glory of Israel. In some Midrashim (Tanhuma, Pesikta Rabbati, Debarim Rabbah, Bemidbar Rabbah) a halakic exordium more or less systematically precedes the proems.

The proem (petihah) (so named from the usual opening formula: Rabbi NN, פתח), which provides the clearest evidence of a deliberate technical arrangement in the haggadic Midrashim,

is, as remarked above, an introduction to the exposition proper.[1] It begins with an extraneous text (the proemial text) which must not be taken from the lesson itself. Thereupon follows an exposition of the proem-text (often amplified by quotations, parables, etc.) or several different interpretations of the proem-text by one or various authors. This material is connected throughout or at least at the end with the lesson or with the initial verse thereof and thus leads into the interpretation of the lesson proper. As an example of such a proem we might cite Vayyikra Rabbah 1,1:

> AND THE LORD CALLED UNTO MOSES (1,1). R. Tanḥum b. Ḥanilai opened [his discourse with the text], Bless the Lord, ye messengers (mal'akim) of His, ye mighty in strength, that fulfil His word, etc. (Ps 103,20). Of whom does Scripture speak? If we are to suppose that Scripture speaks of such as are above, the question arises, is it not in any event said: Bless the Lord, all ye His hosts (ib. 5,21)? Surely then [when Scripture here uses the term 'Mal'akim'], it speaks of such [mal'akim] as are below. Of those above, since they can [unfailingly] execute [all] the charges of the Holy One, blessed be He, it is said, 'Bless the Lord ye messengers of His,' but not 'All ye messengers of His." Another interpretation: 'The prophets are called 'mal'akim." This is indicated by what is written, And he sent a messenger (mal'ak), and brought us forth out of Egypt, etc. (Nm 20,16). Was it then an angel of the Lord? Surely it was Moses! Why then does it call him 'mal'ak'? In fact, from this one learns that the prophets are called 'Mal'akim'. Similarly it says, And the messenger (mal'ak) of the Lord came up from Gilgal to Bochim (Jgs 2,1). Was it then an angel? Surely it was Phinehas! Why then does it call him 'mal'ak'? The truth is, said R. Simon, that the face of Phinehas, when the Holy Spirit rested upon him, flamed like a torch. The Rabbis said: What did the wife of Manoah say to him?--A man of God came unto me, and his countenance was

---

[1] For the petiḥah, cf. Wilhelm Bacher, Die Proömien der alten Jüdischen Homilie (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913); Philipp Bloch, Studien zur Aggadah," Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, 34 (1885), 174-84, 210-24, 257-64.

like the countenance of the angel (mal'ak) of God (ib. 13,6). Evidently she took him to be a prophet, whereas he was not that but an angel. R. Johanan said: There is a decisive passage which shows that the prophets were called 'mal'akim,' namely, Then spoke Haggai, the Lord's messenger (mal'ak) in the Lord's message--mal'akuth (Hg 1,13). Thus we are bound to conclude from this decisive passage that the prophets are called 'mal'akim.'

The mighty in strength that fulfil His word (Ps 103,20). Of whom does Scripture speak? R. Isaac said: Of such as observe the Sabbatical year. We often find that a man fulfils a precept for one day, for one week, for one month, but does he perhaps do so for the rest of the days of the year? Now this man sees his field untilled, his vineyard untilled, and yet he pays his taxes and does not complain--have you a mightier man than this? And if you should say: The verse does not speak of such as observe the Seventh Year, [here is a proof to the contrary]. It is said here, 'That fulfil his word' (dabar), and it is said elsewhere, And this is the manner (dabar) of the release (Dt 15,2). Since by 'dabar' used in the latter passage Scripture means the observance of the Seventh Year, so also by 'dabar' used in the former passage Scripture means the observance of the Seventh Year. . . . Ye . . . that fulfil His word, hearkening unto the voice of His word (Ps loc. cit.). R. Huna in the name of R. Aha said: Scripture here speaks of Israel, who, when they stood before Mount Sinai, undertook fulfilling before hearkening, having said, All that the Lord hath spoken will we fulfil, and hearken (Ex 24,7).

'Hearkening unto the voice of His word.' R. Tanhum b. Hanilai said: Normally a burden which is heavy for one is light for two, or one heavy for two is light for four; but can a burden too heavy for sixty myriads be light for one? Now all Israel were standing before Mount Sinai, and saying: If we hear the voice of the Lord . . . any more, then we shall die (Dt 5,22), whilst Moses heard the voice by himself and remained alive. You have proof that this is so, in that out of all of them He called only Moses; wherefore it is said, AND THE LORD CALLED UNTO MOSES.

Through the homiletic Midrashim it is of course possible to ascertain something of the structure and form of some of the original homilies since larger excerpts from them are available to us here than in the exegetical Midrashim. During the years 1885-86 Philipp Bloch published detailed studies of a few homiletic forms basing his analysis on material drawn from the

Pesikta d'R. Kahana, but unfortunately he never completed the task he began.[1]

One such haggadic structure that Bloch described in addition to the petihah discussed above was the petirah.[2] This form begins with a Biblical verse which is generally followed by the formula: r. . . ptr qry' b. . . (Rabbi N.N. referred the verse to thus and so). This is followed by the interpretation of the individual words and phrases within the verse in terms of the initial specification of the meaning of the whole verse. Thus in Qohelet Rabbah 12,1 there is a comment on Eccl 12,1ff that begins: "Rabbi Joshua ben Levi referred this verse to the Temple," that is, the whole subsequent passage is to be understood as referring to the time during which the Temple in Jerusalem stood. As the exegesis continues each word or phrase of the passage is defined within this framework. Thus, "before the sun grows dark"--this is the kingship of the house of David. "And the light"--this is the Torah. "And the moon"--this is the Sanhedrin, etc. etc.[3]

---

[1] Ph. Bloch, art. cit., 34 (1885), 166-84, 210-24, 257-69, 385-404; 35 (1886), 165-87, 389-405.

[2] Ibid., 34 (1885), 264-69, 385-92. The petirah has also been discussed by Isaac Heinemann in Altjüdische Allegoristik (Breslau: Marcus, 1936), pp. 19, 49-66, and by Lou H. Silberman in "Unriddling the Riddle," Revue de Qumran, 3 (1961), 327-35.

[3] The example is Silberman's. His further remarks on the petirah will be cited in chapter iii in connection with the Qumrân pesharim. Here we are interested merely in structure.

It is part of the structure also that each of the specifications following the all-inclusive introductory specification is introduced by a demonstrative pronoun either in the singular or plural. Also, in each case, including the introductory specification, the definition given is supported by a Biblical verse and by some exegetical device.

In each case when the petirah structure is used the exegesis attributes to the general content of the text-verse an individual concrete specification of it, and thus Bloch calls the petirah an exemplifying homily.

Other structures described by Bloch are the strophic homily in which some verbal or phrasal element is repeated several times in the course of the exposition, and the parable, a homily that explains a text by the use of a parable.

3) Narrative Midrashim: These works exemplify what Geza Vermes has called the "rewritten Bible" type of midrash: a completely rewritten Biblical narrative embellished with legends and non-Biblical traditions (e.g., Sefer ha-Yashar, Pirke de-Eleazar, Midrash Wayyissa'u, Dibre ha-yamim shel Mosheh, Midrash Wayyosha', Midrash Petirath 'Aharon, Midrash Petirath Moshe, etc.).

Examples would be much too lengthy to give here but we would refer the reader to the account of Abraham's life as given in the Sefer ha-Yashar. It is a typical example and selections from it are accessible in Vermes' Scripture and Tradition in Judaism. In this type the interpretative material is not given

at the side of the Scripture text, as it were, but is worked right into the Biblical text to form a continuous narrative.

Biblical Interpretation in the Midrashim

The exegesis that we find in the Midrashim is of a two-fold character. There is first of all a considerable amount of literal exegesis (exposition of the p^{e}shaṭ or plain meaning) which shows evidence of fine linguistic sense, good judgment, and acute insight into the Biblical text.[1] But side by side with this there is, as can be seen from the few examples above, an even larger mass of expositions far removed from the actual meaning of the text, (d^{e}rash interpretations): Biblical accounts are embellished with fanciful details; many things are drawn out of the Bible which the original authors clearly never intended; the Biblical text is even altered in many daring ways and apparently without hesitation.

In this section dealing with Biblical interpretation we shall first of all describe in some detail the major exegetical methods used by the Rabbis in haggadic midrash, especially in connection with d^{e}rash exegesis, and then, secondly, attempt to explain the mentality underlying the d^{e}rash and thereby ascertain the nature and purpose of this type of exegesis.

---

[1] Theodor, art. cit., p. 554; Bacher, art. cit., p. 164; S. Schechter, Studies in Judaism (3d series; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1924), p. 214; Israel Frankel, P^{e}shaṭ in Talmudic and Midrashic Literature (Toronto: La Salle Press, 1956); Braude, op. cit., I, xvi-xvii; etc.

A. Exegetical Methods

The methods used for the exposition of the p^{e}shaṭ we need not dwell upon here. They are in many ways the same as the techniques of our own day (based on grammar, lexicography, critical analysis of the text[1]) and while they are not identical with modern techniques they can be understood on the basis of our own Biblical research.

Requiring a more lengthy discussion are the methods employed for the d^{e}rash exegesis and for this we will rely largely upon the recent and careful study of Isaac Heinemann, Darkê ha-Aggadah.[2] Heinemann divides the rabbinic methods into two general categories which we shall designate as embellished historiography and creative philology.[3]

---

[1]Cf. Frankel, op. cit.

[2]Isaac Heinemann, Darkê ha-Aggadah [The Methods of the Aggadah] (2d. ed.; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Press, 1954). For a summary and review of the book see Jewish Social Studies, 13 (1951), 181-84; also J. Bonsirven, S.J., "Interpretatio Aggadica," Verbum Domini, 30 (1952), 349-52. Heinemann's study includes free haggadah as well as interpretative haggadah (midrash). We will omit from our discussion any of the methods peculiar to free haggadah.--Of interest also for the question of methods are Isaac Heinemann, Altjüdische Allegoristik (Breslau: Marcus, 1936); P. R. Weis, Midrashic Selections ("Semitic Study Series," New Series, No. II; Leiden: Brill, 1955), pp. v-xviii. For a more detailed study of halakic and haggadic philological methods of exegesis cf. Joseph Bonsirven, S.J., Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse paulinienne (Paris: Beauchesne, 1938), pp. 1-259.

[3]Heinemann's terminology is "creative historiography" and "creative philology." These terms are drawn from subjective idealism (Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 4-11). In our discussion we have retained the term "creative philology" as a convenient one

a) Embellished historiography

Embellished historiography is the complementing and amplification of the available facts in an imaginative manner. The method is found in all three forms of rabbinic midrash--the only difference being that in the narrative Midrashim the amplifications are worked in with the original data to form a new running account, while in the exegetical and homiletic Midrashim the embellishing of history remains external to the original text and is done in the form of outside "data" brought to the text for exegetical purposes. Embellished historiography is, of course, not peculiar to midrash. It is found in free aggadah (Jewish folk literature) and in popular history, as well as in the folk literature and popular history of other nations where its use has a variety of motives underlying it.[1]

In midrash its use is an exegetical and homiletic one primarily, its purpose being to clarify the Scriptures and make the Biblical text relevant in one way or another for the writer's audience. Thus embellishments are used to clarify stories and to answer questions raised by lacunae in the text, to aid in the understanding of the text, to eliminate historical and doctrinal

---

for our present purposes but without subscribing to any of its presuppositions as set forth in Heinemann. We have changed the other term to "embellished historiography" because the "creative" label here is of itself too suggestive of the theories of Dilthey, Croce, and Collingwood.

[1]Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 1, 24, 27-28, 35, 39, 44-46.

problems raised by the Bible itself, and to satisfy curiosity. As a homiletic technique amplifications on the text serve to illustrate abstract truths which one wishes to join to the text or which are suggested by the text. They are means of imparting instruction and inspiration. They make the Biblical narrative more attractive, more contemporary, more edifying, more intelligible--and much more real by filling out many of the briefly mentioned and shadowy figures of the Bible.[1]

This is not to say, however, that exegetical and homiletic motives were the only ones operative. Some of the embellished historiography of the Midrashim was also prompted by the motivation behind any folk literature--the desire to tell a good stody--for, undoubtedly, in the course of exegeting and moralizing, the midrashist warmed to his task and elaborated to some degree merely for the sake of elaboration and out of a delight for imaginative details.[2] But this was not the primary purpose.[3]

There are many types and methods of embellished historiography in the Midrashim and we give here some of the major ones with examples in order to illustrate the above remarks.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 21-25, 27-29, 34-37, 56-57, 60, etc. Vermes, op. cit., pp. 68, 83, 95, 125.

[2] Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 23, 49, etc.

[3] It might be helpful to cite here Marc Connelly's Green Pastures (New York: Farrar and Reinhart, 1929) as a non-rabbinic example to illustrate, servatis servandis, something of the process and mentality involved and to provide a basis for sympathetic understanding of the rabbinic counterparts.

1. Etiological stories[1]--The Bible already manifested an interest in etiology and the Midrashim continued in like manner to explain terms and to seek motives and causes for things. In some cases the Midrashim create new explanations based on existing Biblical data. Thus in connection with Eccl 10,8--"a serpent shall bite him who breaks through a fence," it is asked why the snake is found among fences. The Midrash answers that, because the snake was the first to make a breach in the world's fence, he has become the executioner of all who make breaches in fences.[2] Sometimes, however, the midrash will even create the data for new explanations. Such is the case of the explanation of "Ur of the Chaldees [*'ûr kaśdîm*]" in Gn 15,7.[3] The Midrash interprets *'ûr* as "fire" and creates the legend of Abraham in the fiery furnace in Chaldea to explain it.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 18.

[2] I.e., who violate Rabbinic law which is a "fence" to the Torah.--Vayyikra Rabbah 26,2.

[3] "I am the Lord who brought you out of Ur of the Chaldees."

[4] Bereshith Rabbah 38,13; 44,13; Sefer ha-Yashar 6-9. This tradition is at least as old as Pseudo-Philo (Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum 6,14-18). In this connection we might remark once again that the age of this and other traditions to be mentioned below is not the point of interest in our study. We are merely indicating the type of material found in the Midrashim and the methods employed. The age of individual elements is not pertinent for a study concerned with characteristics of the literature.--Géza Vermes sees this legend about Abraham arising out of a desire to find some reason for Abraham's migration from Chaldea to Haran and not out of an interest in etiology; thus the legend says that Abraham left because of religious persecution

2. Compression of the Plot.[1]--In all ancient art there is the phenomenon of compression of the narrative as to time and place for greater picturesqueness and appeal and in order to create a compact historical picture which one can easily grasp. Among the rabbis we find especially the compression of time employed. For example, the Rabbis said that in the eighth hour of the sixth day of creation God stood man upon his feet, in the ninth hour He commanded him, in the tenth man sinned, in the eleventh he was brought to judgment, in the twelfth he was driven out--driven out because when God was about to decree man's destruction the Sabbath arrived and brought about man's expulsion instead.[2] Again on the very day that Noah planted his vineyard he became drunk.[3] Also, people from different ages appear in the same scene. Thus, the Pharaoh who knew not Joseph confers with Balaam, Job, and Jethro.[4]

Another technique in this category is the coalescing of individuals. Thus the Rabbis identified known people (a) with unnamed figures in the Bible and even (b) with people whose names are given in the Bible. As examples of the first we might cite the identification of Abraham's servant with Eliezer.[5]

(op. cit., pp. 88-89). This may well be a factor in the legend, but the theory does not account for the specific detail of the fiery furnace and the resulting borrowings from Daniel.

[1]Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 27-43. [2]Midrash Tehillim 92,3.

[3]Bereshith Rabbah 36,4. [4]Shemoth Rabbah 1,9.

[5]Bereshith Rabbah, 59,9; 60,1.

Also, according to the Rabbis, Eliezer and Ishmael are the unnamed youths in Gn 22,5[1] and "he that feared the word of the Lord among the servants of Pharaoh" (Ex 10,20) was Job,[2] etc. The second method, the identifying of known people with other named figures, is usually based on the similarity or identity of the name. Thus Potiphera, the father-in-law of Joseph, is Potiphar, his master,[3] and the Sons of Korah (Ps 44,1) are the sons of Korah son of Izhar (Ex 6,24).[4] Frequently enough however, even the bearers of different names are made to be one and the same person on the principle that a person has more than one name. Thus Keturah (Gn 25,1) is identified with Hagar.[5]

Most of the foregoing interpretations were for the sake of imparting life-like characteristics to little-known figures in the Scriptures. However, in this same manner the Rabbis sometimes illustrate and concretize the eternal forces which are active in Jewish history. For example, the Amalekites symbolize the enduring hatred of other nations for Israel. Amalek, the chastening rod of Israel according to the commandment received from Esau his grandfather,[6] tells Pharaoh of the escape

---

[1] Vayyikra Rabbah 20,2. [2] Shemoth Rabbah 12,2.

[3] Bereshith Rabbah 86,3.

[4] Midrash Tehillim 44,1; 45,2.

[5] Bereshith Rabbah 61,4. [6] Bemidbar Rabbah 16,18.

of the Israelites from Egypt,[1] attacks Israel not only in Rephidim but afterwards in the form of the Canaanite king of Arad.[2] There are eternal sympathizers of Israel too. Hira, Judah's friend, is Hiram who loved David (3 Kgs 5,15)[3] and possibly even the prince of Tyre who is mentioned by Ezechiel (28,2) and who, the Midrash says, killed Nebuchadnezzar.[4] Such coalescing of figures extends even to animals. The ass that Abraham saddled for the sacrifice of Isaac is the same ass that brought Moses, the Redeemer, back to Egypt and that will some day bring the Messiah.[5] In this manner the Rabbis bring out the internal bond between these three events. Even inanimate objects are identified: Adam's clothes served as a sign of priesthood and passed to Seth, Methusaleh, Noah, Shem, and the Patriarchs.[6] According to another tradition Nimrod inherited the clothes which were made for Adam and Eve and which attracted all the animals to their wearers.[7] Places were also coalesced (Adam was buried in the cave at Machpelah in which Abraham buried Sarah[8]) as well as dates (on Thursday all the waters of Egypt turned to blood, the water of the

---

[1] Mekilta, Beshallah 2,94-96. (The references to the Mekilta are according to the edition of Jacob Z. Lauterbach: Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, 3 vols. (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933-35).

[2] Bemidbar Rabbah 19,20.

[3] Bereshith Rabbah 85,4.

[4] Vayyikra Rabbah 18,2.

[5] Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer 31.

[6] Bemidbar Rabbah 4,8.

[7] Bereshith Rabbah 63,13.

[8] Ibid., 58,8.

Jordan parted before the Ark, King Hezekiah stuffed the springs [2 Chr 32,4] and Jonah ran away[1]).

3. Supplying of details.[2]--The Midrashim frequently supply details which are lacking or not clearly presented in the Bible. The supplying of names which are lacking in the Bible is usually accomplished by identifying personages with other Biblical figures as described above. Times are very frequently specified (i.e., when something happened or when something was written or what age a person was at the time of a certain event). Thus the Midrash specifies the age of Jacob at the time of his marriage,[3] as well as the ages of Ruth[4] and Moses.[5] The purpose of such creations is partially to clarify stories but also to extract inspiring conclusions from such data. Thus for example, the fact that Jacob married at the age of 84 shows, according to Bereshith Rabbah, that God delays the happiness of the righteous. The occasions on which texts were written are also specified to provide an opportunity for concretizing some idea suggested by the text or for showing the suitability of verses for certain universal situations so that the Scripture text might be a source of instruction and inspiration in the

---

[1] Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer 9,10.

[2] Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 21-26.

[3] Bereshith Rabbah 68,5. [4] Ruth Rabbah 4,4.

[5] Shemoth Rabbah 1,30.

lives of the midrashist's audience. Thus according to Midrash Tehillim David uttered Ps 119,105 when he was going into the valley of Rephaim.[1] The Rabbis even contradict the Biblical data on occasion by attributing passages to people who clearly did not utter them.[2]

Details not mentioned in the Bible were also supplied. For example the Rabbis attribute to the people of Sodom sins which are not found in the Scripture account.[3] They specify the sins of Pharaoh's servant,[4] the plagues inflicted upon Pharaoh in Gn 12,17[5] and the sufferings of Hagar.[6] Many of the details of these embellishments were purely imaginative; others were determined on the basis of plausibility, and sometimes embellishments were accomplished by a transference of characteristics from one figure to another as, for example, the borrowings from Daniel in the legend above about Abraham in the fiery furnace. In this same connection children were sometimes described with the traits of ancestors and vice versa. Numerical exaggerations are common: e.g., the number of plagues that smote the Egyptians are given as 10, 50, 200, 250.[7]

Occasionally the rabbis used the slightest hint in the

---

[1] Midrash Tehillim 27,2.

[2] Vayyikra Rabbah 12,2.

[3] Bereshith Rabbah 41,7.

[4] Ibid., 85,2.

[5] Ibid., 41,2.

[6] Ibid., 89,6.

[7] Mekilta, Beshallah 7,109-121.

Bible as the basis for much more extensive embellishments than those mentioned above, as well as for detailed stories which were inspiring and instructive. Thus dialogues between God and men, angels and men, etc., are fabricated.[1] Judah's exploits are elaborated in the Midrash Wayyiss'u and the Sefer ha-Yashar. The verse "your hand shall be on your enemies' neck" (Gn 49,8) was interpreted by a story of how Judah killed Esau in order to protect Jacob[2] in accordance with the hope that the "lion" Judah would overcome Edom the eternal enemy of the children of Jacob. The verse "I, Qoheleth, was king of Jerusalem" is the basis for all the stories of how Solomon was dethroned.[3] Frequently the sufferings of the just are elaborated upon in order to arouse our compassion, as in the case of Joseph's sufferings in the pit which, according to the Rabbis, was filled with snakes and serpents.[4] Then a few lines later we read that the Ishmaelite merchants were transporting balsam and sweet smelling herbs--a reward for Joseph, the righteous man. In this way the idea that the just is rewarded was concretized. These longer stories of the interpretative haggadah, however, are not entirely imaginative but do reflect a certain loyalty to the text of Scripture,

---

[1] E.g., Mekilta, Beshallah 4,1-6.

[2] Midrash Tehillim 18,32.

[3] E.g., Midrash Tehillim 78,12.

[4] Bereshith Rabbah 84,16.

and are strikingly more reserved than are the creations of free haggadah.

4. Anachronisms.[1]--This type of embellished historiography is done largely out of an attempt to eliminate as far as possible the barrier between former ages and the age of the reader. Thus according to the Midrash at the time of Solomon there were 50,000 converts;[2] Abraham makes converts;[3] Noah's ark has all the "modern" conveniences;[4] Esau and Jacob go to school;[5] Adam obeys the laws of the Torah, especially the law of the Sabbath;[6] Isaac demands kosher foods;[7] and David uses a prayer from the ritual of the Day of Atonement.[8] It is interesting to note that in haggadah anachronisms are quite pronounced but not in the halakah where distinctions between different ages are generally made.[9] This serves to emphasize that not all of the anachronisms are due simply to error or naivete.

Another type of anachronism is the quoting of later Biblical verses by the Patriarchs, and their knowledge of future

---

[1]Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 35-43.

[2]Bemidbar Rabbah 8,4. [3]Bereshith Rabbah 39,14.

[4]Ibid., 31,11. [5]Ibid., 63,10. [6]Ibid., 16,5.

[7]Ibid., 65,13. [8]Midrash Tehillim 17,2.

[9]Samuel Rosenblatt, The Interpretation of the Bible in the Mishnah (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1935), p. 35; Heinemann, Aggadah, p. 38.

events. Thus, in the Midrash, Eve quotes Qoheleth and Isaiah;[1] Jacob quotes the Torah,[2] the prophets[3] and the Pss.[4] Lamech's wives know of the coming flood;[5] Rachel is buried in Ephrath so she might plead for the exiles who pass her tomb;[6] David refers to the decrees of Hadrian.[7] In this way the figures of old often serve to verbalize ideas that the rabbis wished to express.

Finally, this latter type of anachronism provides the basis for the creation of very effective and dramatic scenes such as the one at the end of Debarim Rabbah where God, the Heavens, Joshua, the angels, and the people of Israel mourn Moses and apply to him a number of verses only one of which was explicitly stated in connection with Moses in the Bible and many of which come from later books.

5. Contrasts.[8]--Contrasts often involve a distortion of reality, an oversimplification to bring out a particular aspect. There are infinite gradations between hot and cold, good and evil, etc., but in order to emphasize differences contrasts tend to state things in blacks and whites and not take into account the infinite shades of grey lying between. Such contrasts provided the Rabbis with another occasion to embellish history. Thus the wicked are made more wicked,[9] even those of whom the

---

[1]Bereshith Rabbah 19,5. [2]Ibid., 65,18. [3]Ibid., 74,11.

[4]Ibid., 68,11. [5]Ibid., 23,4. [6]Ibid., 82,10.

[7]Midrash Tehillim 12,1. [8]Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 44-45.

[9]E.g., Bereshith Rabbah 70,13.

Bible does not disapprove such as Lot's wife[1] and the Pharaoh under whom Joseph ruled.[2] The good are made more good.[3] National contrasts as well as ethical ones are made, e.g., the comparing of Israel with other nations to the glorification of Israel and her heroes.[4]

On the other hand we also find more realistic pictures and a consequent lessening of moral and national contrasts. Thus the failings of the righteous are elaborated upon[5] to caution people from being excessively confident, to show the evil consequences of sins and to emphasize that God is demanding of His righteous followers. The repentance of the wicked is embellished upon[6] in order to give hope. While the Rabbis recognized full well the ethical and national superiority of the Jews they also realized that to dwell upon this constantly could lead to complacency, and so they often embellished on the faults of Israel[7] and praised the virtues of other nations[8] to indicate how much holier the Jews should be.

6. Eliminating conflicts in the Bible.[9]--The solution of doctrinal and historical difficulties raised by the Bible and

---

[1] Ibid., 50,14. [2] Ibid., 9,2. [3] E.g., ibid., 65,15.

[4] E.g., Midrash Shemu'el 25. [5] E.g., Bereshith Rabbah 87,3.

[6] E.g., ibid., 22,12.

[7] Ibid., 86,5; Midrash Tehillim 3,3; Esther Rabbah 1,17, etc.

[8] Vayyikra Rabbah 5,7. [9] Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 56-74.

of apparent contradictions in the Biblical text also provided opportunities for embellishments. Thus Gn says that Sarah was Abraham's sister. On the other hand Lv 18,9 and 20,17 forbid marriage between brother and sister, and it seemed scandalous that the father of the Chosen People should have disobeyed a divine law. Therefore the Sefer ha-Yashar presents an embellishment that makes Sarah Abraham's niece.[1] Among the contradicting texts mentioned by the Rabbis there are some which contain no contradiction at all. The problem was created merely out of a desire to interpret. Thus Gn 1,16 speaks of "the two large bodies of light" and then "the large body of light and the small body of light." The Midrash answers the difficulty with the embellishment about how the moon's size decreased.[2] Many of these conflicting texts were discussed largely because of the opportunity they provided for a moral lesson.[3]

b) Creative philology

In a discussion of the methods of embellished historiography it is almost impossible to give methodological formulae from the Rabbis themselves. The permission to develop and expand the Biblical material seems to have been self-evident. The situation appears to be somewhat different concerning deduc-

---

[1] Vermes, op. cit., p. 75.

[2] Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer 6.

[3] Heinemann, Aggadah, p. 60.

tion from the Biblical text, for here the Rabbis actually formed certain exegetical rules by which the Torah was to be interpreted. These rules however are primarily concerned with halakah and were looked upon as merely a helpful guide for the haggadist.[1] So for deductions in haggadic midrash, as with embellished historiography, we cannot really give a comprehensive set of exegetical rules from the Rabbis themselves. The best that we can do is to state what the Rabbis actually did. Two general principles, however, governed the Rabbis' approach to the text of Scripture.[2] (1) One must interpret all the minute details in Scripture. This principle was based on the conviction that the Torah is a divine book and that it does not speak in human language. Unlike the language of men, God's word has many meanings

---

[1]Kadushin, op. cit., pp. 120, 122-23; Strack, op. cit., p. 93; similarly, S. Horovitz, art. cit., p. 548. This statement holds true even for the 32 Middot proposed for haggadic interpretation. The author of the Mishnat R. Eliezer (where the rules are given) points out that the midrashic method is not confined by, or limited to, the 32 rules of interpretation. Even these rules, many of which are either borrowed from halakic methodology (14 of them) or else have to do with the elucidation of simple meaning (5 of them), were at most but helpful guides to haggadic interpretation. Cf. H. G. Enelow, ed., The Mishnah of Rabbi Eliezer (New York: Bloch, 1933), English Introduction, pp. 19-20. The text of this Mishnah does state, it is true, that the midrashic method consists of 49 aspects (p. 45 of the text). But the number "forty-nine" in this connection is also found elsewhere (see the note, ibid.) and wherever it occurs the intention seems to be to indicate a large, indefinite number, and to emphasize the variety and multiplicity of interpretations. No attempt is made anywhere to indicate explicitly what these 49 aspects are. Bemidbar Rabbah even places the number at 70 (13, 15-16).--For these and other Rabbinic rules of interpretation, see Strack, op. cit., pp. 93-98.

[2]Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 96-107.

for he can say many things at once. Thus there are no insignificant details in divine language, and all the details are for the purpose of imparting knowledge to us (with a few exceptions stated by the Rabbis[1]). Hence everything is significant in the Bible: anything superfluous in the text, any omissions, the order in which things are referred to, any deviations from common language and spelling, etc. (2) All parts of the Bible (the letters, the words, the verses, and the sections) may be explained not only as a continuity in relation to the context (as with human documents), but also as autonomous units, for the parts retain an independent significance as well as unlimited possibilities of combination with each other. Accordingly, we will discuss the major patterns of creative philology as they relate to letters, words, verses, sections.

1. The Interpretation of Letters.[2]--According to the Rabbis the word division in the Bible is not binding upon the interpreter, and thus he is free to interpret parts of words independently. For example in commenting on Gn 2,1: bhbr'm ("when they were created") the Rabbis read bh br'm ("He created them with the letter hē"), and remarked that just as the hē demands no effort to pronounce, so God created the world without labor or wearying toil.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 97. [2] Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 103-107.

[3] Bereshith Rabbah 12,10.

Sometimes interpretations depended upon the order of letters in the alphabet. Thus, the Midrash refers to the word 'mt as the signature of God, for the aleph is the first letter of the alphabet, the tau is the last, and mem is in the middle. Thus it corresponds to Is 44,6: "I am the first, and I am the last, and beside Me there is no God."[1] Often the form of the letter was considered: In commenting on the first word of the Bible (br'šyt) the Rabbis ask why the world was created with a beth (the first letter of br'šyt). This is because the beth has two points, one pointing upwards and one backwards. So when we ask "Who created thee?" it indicates with its point on top "He who is above created me." And if we ask further "What is His name?" it indicates with its back point the aleph which stands for Adon.[2] In similar manner the sound[3] or the name of the letter[4] or its numerical value[5] often provides a basis for interpretation. Sometimes the letters of a word were made into an acrostic, as in Bereshith Rabbah 84,8 where the psym (in connection with Joseph's garment--Gn 37,3) is taken as an allusion to his misfortunes: the peh for Potiphar, samek for sōḥărîm (traders), yod for Yišmᵉ'ē'lîm (Ishmaelites), and mem for Midyānîm (Midia-

---

[1] Bereshith Rabbah 81,2. [2] Bereshith Rabbah 1,10.

[3] Cf. the example given above from Bereshith Rabbah 12,10.

[4] E.g., Bereshith Rabbah 1,10.

[5] Ibid.

nites)--the last three of whom took part in Joseph's sale to Potiphar. Sometimes a rearrangement of the letters of a word would be employed to provide further insight into a text: thus Nabal and Laban have the same letters in their names and so their characters are alike.[1]

2. The Interpretation of Words.[2]--Just as the individual letters of a word were treated without regard for the word which they formed, so also words were discussed without concern for the sentences which they made up. The order of words in a sentence was sometimes altered (a phenomenon similar to the change in the order of letters in a word). Thus, although it is written: "It bred worms and rotted" (Ex 16,20), the Mekilta says that the worms came after the rotting as experience proves and also as Ex 16,24 states: "And it did not rot nor was there any worm therein."[3] In addition to such cases of metathesis there are interpretations which inject into the text contrasts which were not originally there. This is done to introduce a possibility which the Bible itself did not consider, or even to contradict the meaning of the text. Thus Abraham calls himself "a stranger and a sojourner" (Gn 23,4). The Rabbis take the phrase disjunctively and understand it to say: "I may consider

---

[1] Midrash Tehillim 53,1.

[2] Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 108-130.

[3] Mekilta, Vayassa' 5,15-18.

myself a stranger, but if I want, I can consider myself the owner of this land (since God promised it to me)."[1] In this way the Midrash emphasizes the paradox of Abraham's pleading for a piece of land, when God had already promised the whole land to him. In some cases the Midrash complements a verse with words in order to create a contrast. "It is not a vain thing of you" (Dt 32,47) is interpreted as "it is not a vain thing, but if it is a vain thing it is of (from) you."[2]

Sometimes the words in a sentence were interpreted as individual entities. Such would be the basis for the following comment on Gn 2,16:

> AND THE LORD GOD COMMANDED THE MAN, SAYING: OF EVERY TREE OF THE GARDEN THOU MAYEST FREELY EAT. R. Levi said: He gave him six precepts: AND HE COMMANDED (WAYYEṢAW) alludes to idolatry, as you read: Because he willingly walked after saw--i.e., idols (Os 5,11). THE LORD alludes to blasphemy, as you read, And he that blasphemeth the name of the Lord (Lv 24,16). GOD alludes to the [authority of] judges, etc. . . .[3]

Just as word divisions were not binding so neither were verse divisions. For example, in Bereshith Rabbah 80,6 there are five texts cited in which a word may be taken either with what goes before or with what follows, the sense varying accordingly.

Part of the interpretation of individual words consists in establishing their meaning. (a) The Rabbis' interpretation

---

[1] Bereshith Rabbah 58,6. [2] Bereshith Rabbah 1,14.

[3] Bereshith Rabbah 16,6.

of proper and common nouns reflects their belief that names are given by God and that every single detail is intended to teach us something. Thus they drew out new etymologies and significances which are not found in the Bible. For example, 'l šdy is "The God who said 'enough' [š'mr dy]" to the world, i.e., who fixed its limits.[1] (b) The disregard for the evolution of language (an aspect of anachronism) was a method used in the search for hidden meanings. Changes in phonology (especially the loss of the gutteral sounds in later Hebrew) made possible many new etymologies, as well as facilitated the interchange of words for new interpretations: ḥmh for 'ymh,[2] yḥydy for yhwdy,[3] etc. Changes in word usage were overlooked, and later rabbinic meanings were assigned to the Biblical vocabulary. For example, the word mqwm to the Rabbis was a name for God, and therefore Gn 28,11 "and he encountered the place (mqwm)" is interpreted in the sense: "and he prayed to God."[4] Likewise developments in syntax were disregarded, e.g., participles were read as present tenses as in later Hebrew.[5] (c) Another method used was to interpret the literal as metaphoric[6] and, conversely, metaphorical expressions, as well as idioms, in their literal meaning.[7] (d)

---

[1] Bereshith Rabbah, 46,2. [2] Ibid., 44,17.

[3] Esther Rabbah 6,2. [4] Bereshith Rabbah 68,9.

[5] E.g., Bereshith Rabbah 74,3. [6] Ibid., 53,9.

[7] Ibid., 96,4.

Multiple meanings were sought for words in order to attribute to them an ethical and religious value.[1] (e) It is not always easy to distinguish between the subject and the predicate in Biblical Hebrew but often the Rabbis would depart from the literal meaning where there was no particular obscurity and invert subject and predicate. (f) And, of course, very frequently a change of vowels would be indicated for the given consonants, or even a change of consonants so as to produce a word with similar sound or appearance.

3. The Interpretation of Verses.[2]--In this section we refer to verses which are not independent entities in themselves (such as proverbs) but verses whose meaning is dependent on an understanding of an entire section.

Just as the Rabbis dealt with verses as if they were merely a collection of unrelated words, so also they explained certain sections and chapters as if every sentence dealt with a different subject. For example, the verse "What is man that Thou art mindful of him?" (Ps 8,5) is referred to Abraham; "and the son of man that Thou rememberest him?" is referred to Isaac. "You have made him a little less than God" is referred to Jacob.[3] Similarly each verse in Prv 31,10-31 (on the ideal wife) is applied to a different woman.[4] In this manner some sections were

---

[1]Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 124-25. [2]Ibid., pp. 131-36.

[3]Midrash Tehillim 8,7. [4]Midrash Mishle 31,10.

even turned into dialogues.[1]

Questions were sometimes made into declarative sentences and vice versa.[2] Sentences were quoted out of context. And often the Rabbis associated verses that were not at all related in their literal senses, especially adjacent ones.[3]

4. The Interpretation of Sections (including verses that are independent units).[4]--Just as the over-all unity of words, sentences and sections was disregarded in favor of an atomizing exegesis, so also the over-all unity of books was neglected. For example, in discussing the Canticle no Rabbi attempted a unified interpretation of the themes of the book. This phenomenon in general seems to be due to the fact that the material in the Midrashim is drawn from synagogue sermons which in themselves showed no great unity.[5]

In the interpretation of parables and metaphors we find a tendency not only to follow the aspects of the comparisons indicated by the metaphor, but also to ask: "How much further can one push the comparison beyond the point of view dictated by the context?" Thus they apply metaphors to subjects other than those intended; they interpret in a favorable manner parables and metaphors intended to be unfavorable, etc. For example,

---

[1] Midrash Shir Ha-shirim 1,6. [2] Bereshith Rabbah 98,4.

[3] Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 134-36.

[4] Ibid., pp. 137-61. [5] Ibid., pp. 137-38.

they applied the verse "I am a worm and not a man, a shame among men and despised of the people" (Ps 22,7) not to David himself but to Israel, saying, "Just as a worm is despised among the creatures, so too is Israel despised among the nations."[1]

The Rabbis also found relationships between adjacent sections that are not ordinarily considered to be related. Thus relations are established between consecutive psalms.[2] Also adjacent narrative sections are made to relate. The words "Do not fear, Abraham" (Gn 15,1) imply, according to the Rabbis, that Abraham feared he had killed a righteous man in the war described in the previous chapter.[3] Again, since the account of the spies (Nm 13,1) follows the account of Miriam's slander about Moses (Nm 12,1-16), the midrash states that the spies should have learned from the experience of Miriam the punishment for slander.[4] Narrative sections that are adjacent to portions dealing with commandments are also seen to be thematically related. The death of Miriam (Nm 20,1) follows the laws pertaining to the Red Heifer so as to tell us that the death of the righteous can also atone.[5] Similar thematic connections are established between contiguous sections dealing with commandments.[6]

Even sections that were not adjacent were associated.

---

[1] Midrash Tehillim 22,20. [2] E.g., ibid., 3,2.

[3] Bereshith Rabbah 44,4. [4] Bemidbar Rabbah 16,6.

[5] Heinemann, Aggadah, p. 142. [6] Ibid., pp. 142-43.

Thus people who did similar things were compared: Job suffered and objected; Abraham suffered and accepted it; Hezekiah suffered and asked for sympathy from God; David said: "Why does the whip hesitate? Hit me with it."[1] Two women covered themselves with veils--and gave birth to twins (Rebecca and Tamar).[2] And even passages containing a common word or expression were related on that account. For example, the waters of the Red Sea were split (wybq'w) on the merit of Abraham who split (wybq') wood for the sacrifice of his son.[3] In order to find further relationships the Rabbis even created details.[4]

Another aspect of the interpretation of sections is the ascertaining of reasons for actions, event, and laws. Thus there was an effort to reveal the thinking and motivation behind the actions of individuals. For example, according to the Rabbis, great was the struggle within Joseph when he was tempted by Potiphar's wife and only after the image of his father came to him did he overcome the temptation.[5] Apparently the Rabbis were not interested in determining reasons out of sheer curiosity but out of a desire to find a moral or religious lesson. In the case of the above example they sought to answer the question: "Where does a young man derive the strength to withstand temptation?"

---

[1] Midrash Tehillim 26,2. [2] Bereshith Rabbah 60,15.

[3] Ibid., 55,8, and Mekilta, Beshallah, 4,29-31.

[4] Heinemann, Aggadah, p. 66. [5] Bereshith Rabbah 87,7.

Frequently, therefore, the Rabbis saw the Biblical incidents as parables illustrating a moral. In dealing with events the Rabbis emphasized especially the moral connection between one's actions and one's fortunes. They investigated which sins were responsible for the misfortunes of Israel, for which merits they were redeemed, etc. For example, tale-bearing is given as the primary cause for the delay of the redemption from Egypt, on the basis of Moses' remark: "Surely the thing is known" (Ex 2,14).[1] Tale-bearing also caused the delay in the building of the Temple, whereas the generation of Ahab had a victory for they were not tale-bearers.[2] The Exodus from Egypt is accounted for in various ways in the Mekilta: because of the conduct of the pious women, because of the merit of Abraham, etc.[3] Similarly, in a later section, there are numerous opinions accounting for the crossing of the Red Sea.[4] The reasons for certain commandments are also given with the purpose of emphasizing their significance and as an inducement toward their observance.[5]

Another method worthy of mention is what Heinemann calls "balancing the context." Often the Rabbis would temper the message of a particular section. We find this especially in the introductory sections of the Midrash 'Ekah. In expounding the Book

---

[1] Shemoth Rabbah 1,30. [2] Debarim Rabbah 5,10.

[3] Mekilta, Pisha 16,163-73. [4] Ibid., Beshallah 4,12-77.

[5] Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 146-48.

of Lamentations on the fast of the Ninth of Ab, many of the Rabbis would try to lessen the spirit of sadness of the texts and of the fast day and "balance" the text of Lamentations with optimistic remarks. The same tendency is found elsewhere, e.g., in discussions of texts on sacrifice where the Rabbis sought to "balance" the one-sided mechanical point of view which could be inferred from the texts alone.[1]

Sometimes the idea of a section would be broadened or limited. Interpretations of narratives that are broadening would be typological interpretations, for the Rabbis maintained that events which transpire for ancestors are a foreshadowing for their descendents. Thus the lowly bush [of Moses] is a symbol of lowly Israel,[2] whose flame (i.e., Torah learning) cannot be extinguished.[3] The miracle of Moses with the snake (Ex 7) is a sign of the punishment of the snake, Egypt.[4] Boaz gives Ruth six measures of barley corresponding to the six righteous ones who will descend from them.[5]

The limiting type of interpretation is one that specifies an allusion or statement that is general. This is done above all with the wisdom literature by applying wisdom texts to persons and events in the historical books. The motives are

---

[1] E.g., Vayyikra Rabbah 2,5; 3,5.

[2] Shemoth Rabbah 2,5. [3] Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer 40.

[4] Shemoth Rabbah 9,7. [5] Ruth Rabbah 7,2.

varied: to make the description more vivid, to avoid the monotony which is common to moralizing sermons, to pass judgments on the historical figures in lieu of such judgment from the Bible (the Pentateuch especially), to relate the Torah with the Ketubim. Usually in doing this the Rabbis did not depart from the literal meaning of the wisdom text except in so far as they applied it to someone to whom the original author did not intend to refer. Sometimes, however, the meaning of a text was actually changed. Thus when the Rabbis interpreted the verse: "Day unto day uttereth speech" (Ps 19,3) as referring to the day of Moses and the day of Joshua,[1] they changed a text describing nature's praise of God and made of it an historical allusion. They interpreted "Better is the day of death than the day of birth" (Eccl 7,1) as referring to Miriam, Aaron, Moses, Joshua, David, and Samuel whose day of birth was not heeded but whose death was greatly mourned.[2] In this case the Rabbis changed the original pessimistic intent of the verse.

Commandments also were specified as alluding to particular historical events of the past, present or future. Thus Lv 5,1: "If one should sin and hear the voice of adjuration . . ." is interpreted as referring to Israel standing before Mt. Sinai.[3]

Frequently the narrow interpretation of a particular word

---

[1] Midrash Tehillim 19,8. [2] Qoheleth Rabbah 7,1,4.

[3] Vayyikra Rabbah 6,5.

leads to a narrow interpretation of a whole section of text. Thus the Rabbis' assigning of the meaning "Torah" to bkmh results in a correspondingly narrow interpretation of the Book of Proverbs.[1]

Just as the narrow interpretation of a word can lead to the narrow interpretation of a whole text, so other modifications in the interpretation of single words led to a modified interpretation of sections. This applies especially to the previously mentioned metaphorical interpretations of expressions, for these often lead to allegory since allegory is but an extended metaphor.[2] Unlike Philo, the Rabbis in their allegorical interpretations relied mainly upon metaphors and allegories that are already in the Bible. For example, wisdom is already portrayed in Prv as a woman. Hence the Rabbis interpreted many sections about women as alluding to wisdom. Since the Patriarchs are compared to rocks in Is 51,1 the Rabbis frequently interpret mountains and hills as referring to people: "Tomorrow I shall stand on the top of the mountain" (Ex 17,9). This means: "Tomorrow we shall fast and shall gird ourselves with the merit of the patriarchs (the "top") and the matriarchs (the "mountain")."[3] Similarly, "And the rock is removed out of its place" (Jb 14,18)

---

[1] Heinemann, Aggadah, p. 150.

[2] For this area Heinemann's Allegoristik (cit. supra) is especially valuable.

[3] Mekilta, Amalek 1,96-98.

alludes to Abraham's moving to Gerar.[1] Besides such allegorical interpretations of narratives we also find commandments interpreted allegorically. For example, Nm 5,2 "Command the people of Israel that they put out of the camp every leper, etc." is interpreted allegorically as referring to sins, the exile, etc.[2]

B. The Nature of the Exegesis

The existence of such large quantities of d^{e}rash exegesis in the Midrashim poses the question of how the Rabbis could have departed so drastically from the obvious meaning of the text, especially in view of the fact that they considered the Bible as God's word and that they also went to extraordinary efforts to preserve the text intact in its transmission. The question is an old one--discussed even by Maimonides who gives several of the approaches towards a solution that had been considered up to his time. (1) Some considered the d^{e}rash interpretations as valid and praiseworthy explanations containing extra-Biblical traditions that have not come down to us or reflecting desperate attempts to deal with difficulties in the Biblical text. (2) Some saw the d^{e}rash interpretations as erroneous and proceeding from a degenerate exegetical sense. (3) Others saw them as a form of amusement and playfulness, or (4) as a type of poetry, giving free expression to eternal truths.[3]

---

[1] Bereshith Rabbah 52,1. [2] Bemidbar Rabbah 7,10.

[3] Maimonides, Moreh Nebukim 3,43; Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 2-3.

With regard to the first approach mentioned by Maimonides, it is true that modernly this view has been given some support by the fact that a few d°rash interpretations have been justified with data hitherto unavailable and have been found to contain valid extra-Biblical traditions. But these interpretations are few in number, and equally few in number are the interpretations which could be seriously considered as even possibly reflecting valid traditions. Moreover, of the difficulties that the Rabbis point out as a basis for their interpretations only a small number adequately justify (in the scholarly sense) the rejection of the p°shaṭ. As a matter of fact, in most instances interpretations were not intended to answer difficulties at all; rather the difficulties were invented to provide a basis for interpretations which were interesting or beautiful or otherwise justified to the Rabbis.[1]

The second point of view mentioned by Maimonides faces the difficulty of explaining why this degenerate exegesis is not prominent in the Mishnah, for there, textual rearrangements, revocalization of the consonants, anachronisms, metaphoric and allegorical interpretations, and literal interpretations of metaphors are far less in evidence.[2] Nor should we attribute the d°rash interpretations to a lack of ability or intelligence, for

---

[1] Heinemann, Aggadah, p. 2.

[2] Ibid., pp. 2-3; Rosenblatt, op. cit., p. 35.

over and over again the Rabbis deviated from the p^{e}shaṭ in verses which would offer no difficulty even to people far less intelligent than the Rabbis. In fact, in reading the Midrashim, one becomes increasingly convinced that it was the Rabbis' desire not to be satisfied with the p^{e}shaṭ which caused them to depart from the obvious sense in the haggadic Midrashim.

The third and fourth approaches contain elements for a solution but they do not constitute the whole solution nor are they completely true in themselves. There is indeed a certain amount of playfulness in the haggadah as we shall see below, but there is a certain element of seriousness too. The Rabbis certainly would not have said and repeated: "Bible and Mishnah, halakot and haggadot were given to Moses at Sinai" if they did not consider the interpretations of haggadah holy and superior to other types of literature. As for the poetic, this is to some extent a characteristic of the haggadah also, but the mere stating of it does not explain why the Rabbis deviated from a reasonable treatment of the sacred books and became poetic.[1]

Modern writers in discussing this age old problem have rightly called attention to the rabbinic conviction mentioned above that the Bible is God's word and that God does not speak in human language. For the Rabbis God's word can and does express at once many different things and thus every word and every verse has "49 (or 70) aspects"[2] or hidden meanings and the exegete

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 3-4. [2] Bemidbar Rabbah 2,3; 13,15-16.

can draw out all these meanings over and above the plain sense if only he knows how to do it. It is like striking sparks out of a rock.[1] The Biblical text is perfect and thus every peculiarity of the text has significance and is to be considered as an allusion which provides details in which the Scripture statements are deficient in their literal sense. However, some of these recent writers have seized upon this belief and have made it more or less the basis of their explanations of the Biblical interpretation of Rabbinic Judaism.[2] Again, the belief in hidden meanings is a part of the explanation of the d^{e}rash exegesis and an important part but not a premise upon which one can construct a whole theory of interpretation, for it tends to put the hidden meanings on a par with the literal and this is something that the Rabbis did not do as we shall see below.

It would seem that the proper explanation of this dual phenomenon of p^{e}shat and d^{e}rash exegesis in the Midrashim is to be sought primarily in the homiletic and religious preoccupations of the interpreters.[3] The purpose of haggadic midrash was the

---

[1]Sanhedrin 34a-b.

[2]E.g., Weis, op. cit., p. vii; S. Horovitz, art. cit., p. 548; Lauterbach, op. cit., I, xv.

[3]Bacher, art. cit., p. 165; Weingreen, art. cit., pp. 173-74, 190; Zunz, op. cit., pp. 337-38; Max Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1952), pp. 98-121; Heinemann, Aggadah, passim; Braude, op. cit., I, xv-xvi; Stanley Arthur Cook, "Midrash," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 18 (11th ed.; New York: Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc., 1911), 419-23.

instruction and edification of the masses, and consequently the midrashist by reason of this religious rather than purely scholarly aim endeavored not so much to seek the original meaning of the text as to find religious edification, moral instruction, and sustenance for the thoughts and feelings of his audience. The text of Scripture was the point of departure, for it was God's word, valid for all time. The interpreter would begin with the literal sense. If it was useful religiously, it would be thus expounded. But if in the course of his reflection the Biblical text suggested some idea other than that immediately apparent, then this idea would be set forth in connection with the text. If the literal sense contained a difficulty and thus an obstacle between the text and the audience, the difficulty would be solved and, if possible, some religious value also derived. If the literal sense was obvious or if it was not useful religiously, then a hidden meaning would be sought. Throughout the whole process the belief in hidden meanings was not the primary motivating principle, however. It seems to have been a secondary consideration that helped the process along and served to justify the whole activity. The primary aim was to make the Bible relevant, to make the Bible come alive and serve as a source of spiritual nourishment, refreshment and stimulation.

It is sometimes said that the interpretations in the Midrashim are in reality attempts by the Rabbis to justify or confirm their concepts, ideas, and teachings and to find for them a Biblical foundation. Occasionally this is the situation,

but it is not the general rule by any means, and to make it such would be to do the Rabbis a grave injustice.[1] Actually the Biblical texts played a rôle in the development of rabbinic ideas and were not employed simply as pegs for ideas that had already been thought out--and Midrashic statements were precisely what they claimed to be: interpretations of the Biblical text. We can best describe this interplay between Bible and Midrash as one in which the Bible acts as a stimulus for homiletic material, and in this connection there is a certain kinship between haggadic midrash and poetry as mentioned above.[2] Both the poem and the midrash are touched off by a stimulus. In poetry it is an object perceived; in midrash it is usually the literal sense of the Biblical text. In both cases the stimulus is non-determining: it can produce a multiplicity of effects, for once the stimulus functions, the poet and the haggadist develop the ensuing thoughts in their own personal and individual ways. Thus it is possible to have many poems on the same object and many interpretations on the same verse. And neither a poem nor a midrash is an integral part of a system of thought, an idea logically inferred from other ideas. On the contrary, both are discrete and individual entities.

Just as with the poem, so also with the midrash, the

---

[1] Kadushin, op. cit., p. 12.

[2] Ibid., pp. 113-21, 132ff.; Heinemann, Aggadah, p. 7.

stimulus may play a more extensive role in the development of the thought than that of a mere initial impetus. The resulting ideas may be more or less cast in the terms of the stimulus and thus the ideas are concretized and their development in some way controlled. Sometimes, however, the ensuing ideas may be quite different from the stimulus. In any case both the poet and the midrashist are obliged to give the "sequence of thought" to show the connection between the stimulus and its effect. Often in the case of midrash the connection with the original text consists of hardly more than a play on words but this verbal connection would be quite sufficient.

To illustrate the above remarks we might cite as an example the following midrash on Dt 23,14. The text reads: "And you shall have a stick among your implements (*'ăzēneykā*)." Bar-Kappara expounded: "Do not read *'ăzēneykā* but *'ozneykā* (ears). This means to say that if a man hears an unworthy thing he shall plug his finger into his ears."[1] The text suggested the idea; the sequence of thought was indicated (the change of vowels); the idea was developed in terms of the text (the retaining of the rest of the sentence) and thus the idea was concretized and made vivid. Moreover, the whole process made the Scriptural verse relevant in a religious way (the primary aim) by associating with the text an idea that would be recalled whenever the text was

---

[1] *Ketubot* 5a-b.

encountered.[1]

Here, of course, the analogy between midrash and poetry ceases. It is the nature of poetry to communicate aesthetic experience, while the midrash is concerned with religious and ethical values, and the thought touched off by the Biblical verse is not intended to be judged by standards of style, beauty, and form. But the analogy does help us to see the midrashic comments in their proper relation to the Biblical texts and also to account for the multiple and contradictory interpretations given to a single text.

Granted the homiletic nature of the d^{e}rash interpretations, another question still remains, and that is what precisely the relationship is between these d^{e}rash interpretations and the p^{e}shaṭ. Were they considered p^{e}shaṭ? Did they negate the p^{e}shaṭ or just add to it? Were the Rabbis serious in their endeavors? First of all, the Rabbis were quite aware that d^{e}rash interpretations represent departures from the literal, simple meaning.

---

[1]Again as an aid to a sympathetic understanding of the process we might cite the following example heard by the present writer in a sermon to a group of seminarians. The preacher took for his text: "What did you go out into the desert to see?" And then, although not in so many words, he did what the Rabbis did--"Read not 'see' but 'be.' What will you go out into the desert to be? A reed shaken by the wind? But what will you go out into the desert to be? A man dressed in soft garments? Those who are dressed in soft garments are in the houses of kings. But what will you go out into the desert to be? I say to you, a prophet and more than a prophet . . . ," and he went on to develop that for his audience. The text suggested the idea and played a role in its development; the sequence was indicated; and the idea was concretized in terms of the text.

Their terminology testifies that they differentiated between the non-literal interpretation and the simple meaning. In the Amoraic period we find the terms p^{e}shaṭ and d^{e}rash themselves, while in the Mishnaic period, before the development of these terms, wd'y and kmšm'w were used as equivalents of p^{e}shaṭ to designate the simple meaning, and to set it off from non-literal interpretations.[1] Moreover, the Rabbis actually taught the simple meaning as we can see from the hundreds of instances of p^{e}shaṭ exegesis in the Midrashim as well as from the sober tone of the exegesis in the Mishnah and the Targum Onkelos. Furthermore, they taught that "a biblical verse never loses its literal meaning"[2] regardless of how the verse may be employed in rabbinic interpretation. This principle affirms that the literal meaning is stable and primary, that rabbinic interpretations are added matters and secondary, and that each interpreter should bear in mind the literal meaning of the verse regardless of what his predecessors have done with it. So by and large the d^{e}rash interpretations were not confused with the plain sense.

On some occasions, however, the Rabbis did assume that a d^{e}rash interpretation represented a text's simple meaning, or else they deliberately set aside the p^{e}shaṭ with it.[3] This would

---

[1] W. Bacher, Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1899-1905), I, 48-49, 190-92; II, 60-61, 221-22.

[2] Shabbat 63a; Yebamot 11b, 24a.

[3] Heinemann, Aggadah, pp. 129-30, 136, 153-56.

occur when the usage of a particular word was old and unfamiliar to them, or when their oral traditions (especially halakic) were at variance with the written tradition. They would also set aside the p^{e}shaṭ to remove anthropomorphisms and solve conflicts in the text, as well as to vindicate the actions of Israel and her heroes. Likewise in their handling of such material as the Canticle which they saw as a secular writing or of Qoheleth who they felt had inclinations to heresy, they would negate the plain meaning with d^{e}rash interpretations.

In most cases, however, the d^{e}rash was not intended to replace the p^{e}shaṭ but to add to it in one way or another.[1] Often the d^{e}rash would have no relationship to the p^{e}shaṭ and would be something entirely extraneous to the text. Sometimes, however, the d^{e}rash would be related to the literal sense and would give to it a deeper meaning so that if one could combine the two and see the twofold meaning, one would attain a complete understanding of the verse.

When the Rabbis set aside the p^{e}shaṭ or set aside the comments of their fellow interpreters, we may assume that they acted in all seriousness. But when they added to the literal sense without rejecting it, how much seriousness and how much playfulness was involved? In some of the interpretations there is a good deal of playfulness involved. A few of the comments

---

[1] Ibid.

were intended to be humorous, and some of the surprising associations, exaggerations and paradoxes undoubtedly were nothing else than "attention-getters"--devices used by preachers to capture and sustain interest from their audiences.[1] The rest seem to lie somewhere midway between complete seriousness and playfulness.[2] They are not taken as seriously as the words of the Bible or even as seriously as halakic interpretations. But there was a serious aspect to them. The interpretations were intended to make the Bible relevant to the audience and this was a serious endeavor. To make the Bible relevant, relevant and inspiring ideas had to be drawn out of the text or connected with the text, and these ideas were taken seriously. Because of the close connection between the ideas and the text, and in order to make these ideas attractive, memorable, and suited to the folk level the ideas were concretized in terms of the text or embellishments on the text. These concretizations were taken seriously to the extent that they expressed and made vivid the ideas for which they were the vehicle, but usually to no greater extent than that because many of them clearly contradicted the Biblical account or other rabbinic interpretations; descriptions of God were clearly anthropomorphic, etc. Thus, God

> acts as best man at the wedding of Adam and Eve; he mourns over the world like a father over the death of his son when the sins of ten generations make its destruction by the

---

[1]Heinemann, Aggadah, p. 12. [2]Ibid., pp. 186-95.

> deluge imminent; he visits Abraham on his sick-bed; he condoles with Isaac after the death of Abraham; he "himself in his glory" is occupied in doing the last honors to Moses, who would otherwise have remained unburied, as no man knew his grave; he teaches Torah to Israel, and to this very day he keeps school in heaven for those who died in their infancy; he prays himself, and teaches Israel how to pray; he argues with Abraham the case of Sodom and Gomorrah not only on equal terms, but tells him, If thou thinkest I acted unworthily, teach me and I will do so.[1]

Stories, episodes, and interpretations like these were obviously not believed in an unqualified manner, but neither were they told with tongue in cheek.[2] They concretized abstract ideas (in these instances, the love of God) and they brought the Bible to life. They were the creations of men who brought, not science, but faith to the Bible and who came away with an even greater faith. And they had their effect, as the Rabbis rightly felt. "Wouldst thou come to know Him Who spoke and the world came to be, then study Haggadah," runs an early rabbinic saying, "for by that means you will come to know the Holy One, blessed be He, and to cleave to His ways."[3]

Conclusion: The Primary Characteristics of Haggadic Midrash

We have set forth above the major characteristics of

---

[1] S. Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (New York: 1910), p. 37 and the references there.

[2] Kadushin (op. cit., pp. 131-42) speaks of "indeterminate belief": a belief, but a belief that does not ordinarily crystallize into positive affirmation.

[3] Sifre to Dt 11,22, end.

the rabbinic midrashic literature, characteristics relating to literary structure, methods and aims. The task that now must be faced is the one of sifting the primary characteristics from the secondary and the attempt to formulate a definition of the literary form midrash.

1) Literary Structure: From the point of view of structure there are several rather diverse forms of literature that are designated as midrash. There are the homilies originally given in the synagogues. There are the homiletic Midrashim in which these homilies or parts of them are reproduced or reworked and assembled together in some order. There are the exegetical Midrashim which are collections of large numbers of interpretations artificially arranged in textual sequence so as to provide haggadic commentaries for individual books of the Bible. And finally there are the narrative Midrashim--Biblical narratives rewritten and embellished with stories gathered from various sources. Not only the original homilies but all of these literary structures are called midrash. Moreover, as was pointed out above, every midrashic statement is a logically independent unit that is complete in itself--even to the extent that contradictory interpretations can be placed side by side in the Midrashim. Even apparently unified compositions such as the homilies consist essentially of several of these independent units, and the various larger forms (the exegetical and homiletic Midrashim as well as the homilies themselves) are merely attempts to unify otherwise

independent units so as to make for sustained interest on the part of the audience. Hence an individual midrashic statement can be called a midrash also.

Now a primary characteristic of a genre should be able to be verified in all the manifestations of that genre, and characteristics that are found only in one or another type should be classified as secondary characteristics. We would conclude, therefore, that the basic midrashic structure, common to all forms that can be labeled midrash down to the smallest independent unit, is merely that one begins with a text of Scripture and proceeds to comment on it in some way. The midrashic unit must be so structured that the material contained therein is placed in the context of a Scripture text, and is presented for the sake of the Biblical text; it is a literature about a literature.

2) Aim: The aim of haggadic midrash, as can be seen from the historical sketch above and from the literature itself, is to comment on the Scriptures, to make them religiously relevant to the contemporaries of the haggadist, to make yesterday's text (which is the word of God for all time) meaningful and nourishing for today. Midrash has, therefore, a religious and edifying aim and not primarily a scholastic one.

3) Content: Content is the basis for the distinction between halakic and haggadic midrash (legal v. nonlegal discussion of a text), and therefore content enters into a definition of these two species of midrash. However, content does not appear

to be a factor in the definition of the genus midrash, for there seem to be no topics or themes peculiar to midrash or that flow from the very nature of the literature. We can find in the Midrashim discussions of everything from cabbages to kings--literally--and it is very risky to say that a particular theme or topic is not represented in the literature.[1] And for the same reason no aspects of content other than "legal and non-legal" should enter into the definition of the species halakic and haggadic.

It is of course possible that detailed studies of rabbinic midrash in the future might disclose that certain themes or outlooks, etc., are de facto lacking in rabbinic midrash. We do not exclude this possibility. But if this were the case, it would be a matter of secondary characteristics since it would be an aspect contingent upon the interests and preoccupations of a given historical period rather than a feature flowing from the nature of midrash. The point that we wish to make here is that so diversified and all embracing are the rabbinic discussions that no particular themes appear to be tied to the form midrash

---

[1] E.g., Lane's claim ("A New Commentary Structure in 4Q Florilegium," Journal of Biblical Literature, 78 [1959], 346) that messianic and eschatological orientations are lacking in rabbinic midrash cannot be supported (cf. the conclusions of the homilies). Nor can Silberman's statement (art. cit., p. 329) that contemporizing is lacking in rabbinic midrash be supported. For example, the identifications of Edom with Rome, so frequent in the Midrashim (and cited by Silberman--p. 331), were contemporizing comments at the time the particular interpretations were composed.

as primary characteristics.

4) Type of Exegesis: Is d^{e}rash or creative exegesis among the primary characteristics of the literary form midrash?[1] The question is not easy to answer.

From one point of view it would seem that d^{e}rash exegesis is not among the primary characteristics. It is true that the rabbinic Midrashim contain a vast amount of non-literal exegesis and that as time went on more and more of it was employed in them, but there is also a substantial amount of literal exegesis. It is also true that to a certain extent d^{e}rash exegesis flows from the nature of midrash (in so far as midrash is a popular and devotional type literature and therefore prone to this type of exegesis); but actually the d^{e}rash exegesis is largely due to the concept of Scriptural inspiration in antiquity, i.e., that when God speaks in human language He says hundreds of things at once and thus there are many hidden meanings to be uncovered. For these reasons the d^{e}rash type of exegesis is seemingly an accidental characteristic due to time of composition and other circumstances.

On the other hand there is one fact that suggests that "creative exegesis" is one of the primary characteristics. The production of midrashic literature is commonly thought of as ceasing around the 13th century A.D. with the last of the great

---

[1] p^{e}rash exegesis is of course essential to midrash when the word midrash designates a type of exegesis. Here we speak of midrash in the sense of a literary form.

compilations, and the word midrash is not used today to describe any modern homiletic exposition of Scripture. The word midrash is by convention reserved for the earlier predominantly creative exegetical literature.

For our study the point has little practical importance since the authors of the pre-rabbinic literature in which we shall seek examples of midrash shared the creative exegetical mentality with the later rabbis. The point is of practical importance only if one is searching for post-13th century examples of midrash, in which cases, because of conventional usage, we must conclude that the note of "predominantly creative exegesis" must be expressly stated as a primary characteristic. We should note, however, that in the case of both pre-rabbinic and post-13th century midrash it is a matter of predominantly creative exegesis; any single midrashic statement could be of the literal or peshaṭ type.

5) Exegetical Methods: The methods of exegesis found in rabbinic midrash are not among the primary characteristics of the literary form, and one is not justified in demanding that a literary work must employ one or another of these methods before it can be called a midrash. To fasten attention on the individual methods described above and to set them up as criteria of midrash is to become fascinated with a multiplicity of techniques and to miss the basic operation underlying all of them.

As we have seen above the exegetical methods were employed by the Rabbis in order to show the sequence between the

Scripture text and the haggadic thought. Thus in creative philology the relation between text and haggadah is established by acrostics, or rearranging of letters, etc.; and in embellished historiography the relation between the original text and haggadic solutions of problems and other actualizing material is accomplished by working the new material into the text. But in both cases the methods are simply concrete manifestations of a general and constant primary preoccupation, the indication of sequence (cf. p. 118). And it is this indication of sequence that is the only primary characteristic of midrash in the area of method. How it is accomplished is secondary and contingent upon the background and talents of the haggadist and upon the particular period in the history of the development of midrash that the work comes from.

This view of the rabbinic methods is borne out by the fact that in haggadic interpretation the Rabbis were not bound to specific rules. Rules of interpretation were given[1] (which were apparently no more than statements of accepted practices of previous Rabbis) but they were used only as helpful guides, and the haggadist was free to use whatever means suggested themselves in order to establish sequence. In other words the important thing was the indication of sequence. The method was secondary and up to the individual to find a cogent way to do it. Moreover, many

---

[1]Cf. above, p. 103, n. 1.

of the rabbinic rules of exegesis were derived from pagan sources. As has been pointed out above and demonstrated by Saul Lieberman, a number of the rabbinic rules for Biblical interpretation were current in the literary world at that time and even relate back to hoary antiquity, for they were used by both Jews and non-Jews in the interpretation of dreams and by non-Jews in the interpretation of oracles as well.[1] Hence many of the rules that served as guides for the haggadist (and thus to a certain extent the whole method in which Scripture was approached) were not developed within the framework of midrash with an organic relationship to that literary form. Rather they were well-established devices that were resorted to by the Rabbis in order to satisfy one of the demands of midrash, the indication of sequence between the text and the haggadic idea. And these particular methods were chosen simply because the argumentation produced by them would be familiar, understandable, and forceful to the haggadist's contemporaries.

It should be further noted here that the indication of sequence between text and haggadic statement is really less a requirement of midrash than it is a demand of the human mind. In other words for the comment on the text to be meaningful to the audience it must appear to be related to the text in some way. From the examples of midrash cited above in chapter ii we

---

[1]Saul Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1950), pp. 68-82.

can see that the indication of sequence is not always explicit. The connection between comment and text is sometimes left unstated and the audience is expected to see the connection. And sometimes, as for example in the case of the identification of Edom with Rome where the value assigned appears to be quite arbitrary, the interpretation is in fact based on a conventional value assigned to a term in the text. Consequently the explicit indication of sequence will not always appear in an interpretation and we must not make the indication of sequence a necessary element of the visible structure. The indication of sequence is necessary only logically and it may be accomplished implicitly.

We might also note that just because one finds rabbinic exegetical methods being employed one is not necessarily in the presence of a midrash. For example, the methods of embellished historiography can be and were used in the service of free haggadah, and some of the methods of creative philology were used for the interpretation of dreams.

From the point of view of exegetical method, some have proposed that careful analysis of the text is a primary characteristic of midrash.[1] In the rabbinic midrash this certainly is a prominent feature. However, every midrashic statement is not based on careful analysis, and it is conceivable that pre-rabbinic material might be found which does comment on a text but

---

[1]Bloch, "Midrash," cols. 1265-66; Joseph S. Fitzmyer, "'Now This Melchizedek. . . .' (Heb 7,1)," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 25 (1963), 305.

without attentive analysis of the words, etc. It would seem that such material should not thereby be excluded from the category midrash. As with the note "creative," perhaps the best way to express the matter is that midrash frequently is characterized by a careful analysis of the Biblical text, but any single midrashic statement may be an exception to the general rule.

6) Is the note "Jewish" a primary characteristic of midrash? It would seem that Christian discussions of the OT in the NT and later Christian homiletic discussions of the Bible which manifest the other primary characteristics of midrash could legitimately be called midrash also. Such literary works stand in the same tradition as the Jewish material as an offshoot of the parent stem, and the mere fact that the word midrash is Hebrew and that we have set up as the exemplar of our modern literary category the Jewish Midrashim, should not deter us from seeing the two groups of literature as being two species of the same literary genre. Samaritan works of the same type could also be called midrash.[1]

In her article in the Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, Mlle. Bloch states that the fact that midrash takes its departure from Scripture excludes all possibility of finding parallels to this literary genre outside of Israel. Faith in a revelation which is consigned to sacred books is an essential

---

[1]E.g., the Midrash of Marqah; cf. M. Heidenheim, Der Commentar Marqoh's des Samaritaners (Weimar: Felber, 1896).

prerequisite for writers of this literary form.[1] Recently, however, François Daumas has called attention to several previously published Egyptian works which seem to bear witness to the existence of a prophetic literature and the exegesis thereof in ancient Egypt.[2] One demotic papyrus dating perhaps from the beginning of the Ptolemaic period in Egypt is a section by section commentary on an apparently prophetic document of the same period and bears strong resemblance to the Qumran pᵉsharim in form and aim. Other material from Egypt bears witness to the explanatory glossing of prophetic texts as far back as the Middle Kingdom and the glossing of other material even earlier. The dependence of later Jewish midrash on such Egyptian material has yet to be established, but, if such a dependence does become clear, we can see no reason for refusing to classify the Egyptian material as midrash. Like the Christian material, the Egyptian would stand in the same tradition. If, however, the Egyptian material stands in a tradition independent of Jewish midrash, then the term midrash should be avoided[3]--or if it is

---

[1] Bloch, "Midrash," col. 1265.

[2] François Daumas, "Littérature prophétique et exégétique egyptienne et commentaires esséniens," A la rencontre de Dieu: Mémorial Albert Gelin (Le Puy: Xavier Mappus, 1961), pp. 203-21.

[3] For the ancient authors were conscious of writing not so much in a particular genre as in a particular tradition (cf. the remarks of Vawter cited in the Introduction, p. 21) and this fact should find some expression in a definition of a genre.

used, it should be seen as an improper and analogous use in lieu of a better title.

We would conclude, therefore, that haggadic midrash is a composition that comments on a Biblical text. It is a literature about a literature. It is a work that attempts to make a text of Sacred Scripture understandable, useful, and relevant for a later generation. It is the text of Scripture which is the point of departure, and for the sake of which the whole discussion (at least ostensibly) exists. The discussion of the text can be of any type (literal or non-literal exegesis) but it is predominantly non-literal or creative, and it can go as far afield as it wishes provided that at some stage at least there is to be found some connection, implicit or explicit, between the Biblical text and the new composition. At times this connection with the text may be convincing, at times it may be desperate; it is sufficient merely that a connection however artificial, be there. Frequently the discussion will be characterized by a careful analysis of and attention to the Biblical text.

We have been led by our investigation to a definition close to one of those proposed by Renée Bloch, i.e., that midrash is homiletic reflection on the Bible which seeks to apply a given text of the past to present circumstances.[1] We would prefer to speak of a <u>work</u> or <u>composition</u> rather than of "reflec-

---

[1]Bloch, "Midrash," cols. 1265-66.

tion" to make clear that we are speaking of the literary form midrash and not of the exegetical method midrash or of the activity of Biblical interpretation in general (an ambiguity frequent in Bloch's work); but aside from that we would agree with this one definition of Mlle. Bloch and with her statement that the two primary characteristics of midrash are "le rattachement et la référence constante à l'Écriture" and "l'adaptation au présent."[1] Admittedly the definition is broad and is set up with only gross qualifications and characteristics. But we have given above (pp. 143-154) the reasons that militate against a more detailed and limited definition that would include specific rabbinic structures and methods as components. Attention to such factors is irrelevant to an understanding of midrash as a literary form and only impedes and frustrates any attempt fully to understand the material at hand.

Of course the fact that our investigations have led us to concur with one of Mlle. Bloch's definitions of rabbinic midrash by no means implies that we are in complete agreement with her application of the definition to pre-rabbinic literature or with the attempts of others who have followed her lead. The definition we share in common is broad but we do not understand it as being so broad as to include every conceivable literary use of prior Scripture as seems to be the understanding behind much

---

[1] Ibid., col. 1266.

of the recent writing on midrash. An elaboration of these remarks will constitute the third and final chapter.

CHAPTER III

THE SEARCH FOR HAGGADIC MIDRASH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND INTERTESTAMENTAL LITERATURE

In the present chapter we shall, first of all, attempt on the basis of our findings in chapter ii to point out early examples of the literary genre midrash in the Old Testament and Intertestamental Literature. Secondly, we wish to indicate what we consider to be the errors in recent discussions of midrash. And thirdly, we hope to have the occasion to make more explicit some elements of our working definition of midrash, so that we might be able to come perhaps to an even more precise expression of what constitutes this literary form.

It has not been our aim to discuss all of the examples of midrash in our literature or even to attempt to consider all of them in our research. However, we have investigated a number of texts of different kinds which constitute, we believe, a representative cross section of our material, and of these we shall here discuss selected examples of each kind in a number sufficient to establish general principles of procedure and to support distinctions and observations made.

In treating this material, we shall discuss first of all

works that are midrash in their entirety, as well as some non-midrashic works by way of contrast (pp. 158 - 194). We will then consider some midrashic portions of works of other genres (pp. 194 - 249), and finally discuss three related literary genres (history, apocalyptic, and what we shall tentatively call mashal) (pp. 249-265).

The Pesharim

Soon after the discovery and publication of the Biblical commentaries from Qumran the question arose as to whether or not these commentaries (or pesharim as they have come to be called) should or could be called midrash. Three positions have been taken over the years: that they are not midrash, that they are midrash, and that they are midrash pesher (in contradistinction to midrash haggadah and midrash halakah). The discussion is still joined from time to time, authors siding with one or other of these positions.

Those who deny the propriety of the use of the term midrash in connection with the pesharim have done so for various reasons. Millar Burrows states that "midrash is a homiletic expansion of a biblical book or part of a book for the purpose of edification" and that its method of exposition is either like a popular expository lecture in which the opinions of various authors are cited and problems of exegesis discussed or like the telling of a Bible story. The Habacuc pesher does not have this

structure and form and therefore is better labeled a commentary.[1] J. L. Teicher refused to call the Habacuc pesher a midrash because its aim is different from that of the Midrashim in that the purpose of the pesher is to show how certain significant events represent the unravelling of the mysteries of the prophetic utterances. Thus the pesher should be called an apocalyptic commentary.[2] Géza Vermès writing in 1951 agreed with Teicher because he felt that midrash is an exegetical research either to establish law from the Bible (halakah) or to discover in the Bible moral or religious teachings (haggadah).[3] In 1954 Vermès again held that the pesher is not a midrash but this time because the pesher differs in structure from the Midrashim in that the pesher is a paraphrase of a Biblical text and not a "more or less independent development as is often the case in midraš." Moreover the pesher does not cite other Biblical books nor the opinions of teachers.[4] Karl Elliger in his work on the

---

[1]Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: Viking, 1955), p. 211. Cf. also Burrows' remark in a personal letter to Professor Brownlee in William H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," The Biblical Archaeologist, 14 (1951), 76.

[2]J. L. Teicher, "The Dead Sea Scrolls--Documents of the Jewish-Christian Sect of Ebionites," Journal of Jewish Studies, 2 (1951), 76.

[3]G. Vermès, "Le 'Commentaire d'Habacuc' et le Nouveau Testament," Cahiers Sioniens, 5 (1951), 344-45.

[4]Idem, "A propos des Commentaires bibliques découverts à Qumrân," La Bible et l'Orient: Travaux du premier congrès

Habacuc pesher insisted that the pesher differs from midrash in that the pesher's interpretations are not derived essentially from the text but merely stand "neben dem Text." Moreover the structure of the pesher is less detailed and developed than that of the midrash.[1] Cecil Roth felt that the attempt to characterize the pesher literature as midrash leaves out of account the principal characteristic of the pesher: that it does not elucidate the Biblical text as does midrash but determines the application of certain Biblical prophecies to current and even contemporary events.[2] Finally, Dupont-Sommer defines midrash as "stories depending on 'haggadic' tradition" and "purely imaginary developments" on Scripture and sees this as differing radically from the genre of the pesharim. The pesharim "aim at discovering predictions in the Biblical text relating to the end of the world, whereas the midrashim endeavor to make the story of the past more vivid and full."[3]

Another group of authors has insisted that the pesharim are very definitely midrash, and again for a variety of reasons:

---

d'archéologie et d'orientalisme bibliques (Saint-Cloud 23-25 avril 1954) (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955), pp. 96-97.

[1]Karl Elliger, Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953), pp. 163-64.

[2]Cecil Roth, "The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis," Vetus Testamentum, 10 (1960), 51-52.

[3]A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, trans. by G. Vermes (Cleveland: Meridian, 1962), pp. 280-81, 310.

Brownlee because the exegesis of the pesharim is midrashic;[1] Seeligmann[2] and Delcor[3] because the pesher actualizes Sacred Scripture; Bloch because it actualizes Scripture and uses midrashic techniques;[4] Silberman because the pesher's aim, method and structure can be found in the Midrashim;[5] Michel because it is history written in the light of earlier history as found and interpreted in a book of the Bible.[6] Milik,[7] Allegro,[8] and van der Ploeg[9] call the pesharim midrash but in Qumrân's generic sense of the term ("exegesis, interpretation") and not in the rabbinic or

---

[1]Brownlee, art. cit., p. 76.

[2]I. L. Seeligmann, "Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegese," Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, I (Leiden: Brill, 1953), 171, n. 1.

[3]M. Delcor, Essai sur le midrash d'Habacuc (Paris: Cerf, 1951), p. 77.

[4]Renée Bloch, "Midrash," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, 5 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1957), col. 1277.

[5]Lou H. Silberman, "Unriddling the Riddle," Revue de Qumran, 3 (1961), 323-64.

[6]A. Michel, Le Maître de Justice (Avignon: Aubanel, 1954), pp. 26-28.

[7]J. T. Milik, "Fragments d'un midrash de Michée dans les manuscrits de Qumrân," Revue Biblique, 59 (1952), 413, n. 4.

[8]J. M. Allegro, "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrāšîm," Journal of Biblical Literature, 78 (1958), 350.

[9]J. van der Ploeg, O.P., "Le rouleau d'Habacuc de la grotte de 'Ain Feša," Bibliotheca Orientalis, 8 (1951), 2; Idem, "Les manuscrits de Désert de Juda Livres récents," Bibliotheca Orientalis, 16 (1959), 163.

modern technical sense. Daumas follows van der Ploeg but also sees in the pesharim a genuine midrashic search for hidden meanings in the Scriptures.[1] Lane reserves the term midrash for the complex type pesher only (4Q Fl) since Qumran used it and since this is a convenient way to distinguish this type of pesher from the simple ones--but midrash "in the Qumran rather than the rabbinic sense of the term, i.e., with the same messianic, eschatological orientation as much of the rest of their literature."[2]

In 1953 Brownlee suggested a new classification, midrash pesher by which the pesharim might be both related to (on the basis of type of exegesis) and distinguished from (on the basis of style and content) the previously known rabbinic Midrashim of the classes midrash halakah and midrash haggadah.[3] This classification has been adopted by Krister Stendahl who uses it apparently to relate the pesharim to rabbinic midrash on the basis of the "realistic nature" of pesher interpretation and to distinguish them from rabbinic midrash because of their sectarian character.[4] The same classification is used by Grelot who sees

---

[1]Daumas, art. cit., pp. 204-205.

[2]William R. Lane, "A New Commentary Structure in 4Q Florilegium," Journal of Biblical Literature, 78 (1959), 346.

[3]W. H. Brownlee, The Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan (mimeographed; Duke University, Feb. 2, 1953). Cf. also the same article, somewhat revised: "The Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan," Journal of Jewish Studies, 7 (1956), 179, n. 38.

[4]Krister Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew (Uppsala: Gleerup, 1954), p. 184.

the midrash pesher as differing from hagadah and halakah in that it actualizes prophetic Scriptures (and eventually other types) in showing their accomplishment in the events of the near past and present in order to infer what will happen in the future.[1]

Throughout all of these discussions it has become clear that the problem lies in two areas: the definition of midrash and the mode of expressing the very real differences between pesher and midrash. An assortment of definitions of midrash have been brought to the discussion, and sometimes the definitions of midrash have been rather limited and restricted ones and one wonders if it is not sometimes a case in which authors, seeing the real difference between the pesher and the midrash and trying to express this difference, consciously or unconsciously construct definitions of midrash which result in the exclusion of pesher from the genre midrash.

On the basis of the conclusions that we have drawn in Chapter Two on the definition of midrash we of course would unhesitatingly classify the pesharim as belonging to the literary genre midrash--because the pesharim actualize Biblical texts, make them meaningful for the sect, and show where the secrets of the sect are to be found in the Scriptures. The Biblical text is the point of departure throughout the material and that for the sake of which the pesher exists--at least ostensibly because of the

---

[1] P. Grelot, "L'interprétation catholique des livres saints," Introduction à la Bible (ed. A. Robert et A. Feuillet), I (Tournai: Desclée, 1957), 175.

structure (and perhaps in fact also) and that is sufficient to make it midrash.

The questions of method, structure, type of exegesis and content are all of interest for a history of the development of the literary form midrash and they are of interest for a history of Jewish exegetical methods but we do not admit that they determine the literary form. Method, structure, and content we believe are secondary characteristics. The solution of the problem of literary form should be based on primary characteristics.

How then should we express these secondary differences between the pesher and rabbinic midrash? Tentatively we would suggest the classification "Qumran" or "Essene" midrash as opposed to "rabbinic" midrash, but only tentatively because it is very risky to be setting up relationships between groups of material before the exact relations have been worked out by literary analysis. Already Silberman has pointed out some very striking resemblences in structure, method and aim between the pesher and the midrashic petirah,[1] and Elliger and others have pointed out relationships between the pesher and Daniel.[2] It is only after further work of this sort that we will be able to situate the pesher accurately in the Jewish exegetical material.

One thing however is certain. The threefold division: midrash haggadah, midrash halakah, midrash pesher is not satis-

---

[1]Silberman, art. cit. [2]Elliger, op. cit.

factory and should be abandoned. The classifications halakah and haggadah are based upon content (legal v. non-legal discussion of a text) and are mutually exclusive terms as set up by the rabbis. There is not room for another classification according to content[1] --least of all for one that signifies messianic, eschatological content, for that sort of thing can be found in the haggadic Midrashim as we have pointed out earlier, The pesharim then are haggadic midrash.

The term pesher (which is our designation and not Qumran's) will probably continue to be used to designate the Qumran commentaries since the pattern has been set by scholarly usage. It can thus serve as a convenient designation for the secondary characteristics peculiar to these works (whether these be in the area of structure, or the sectarian aspect, or even content provided that in the latter case the term pesher is not seen as opposed to haggadah and halakah). Even the term midrash pesher would not be unacceptable if it is freed from the tripartite content division it has been associated with and used to designate some other aspect.

The Midrash of the Passover Haggadah

Another early example is the midrash on Dt 26,5-8 in the Passover Haggadah, the liturgy for Passover eve. Louis Finkelstein convincingly argues that the work dates from the last half of the

---

[1]Thus also Silberman, art. cit., p. 328, n. 10.

third century B.C. or the first half of the second and inclines toward the former date.[1] Daube[2] and Seeligmann[3] opt for the latter. We here give Finkelstein's translation:

I. 1. Go forth and learn. What did Laban the Aramaean intend to do to our father, Jacob? For Pharaoh decreed the destruction only of the males, while Laban sought to destroy the whole family. Thus it is written, The Aramaean sought to destroy my father and he (my father) went down into Egypt and sojourned there, few in number, and he became there a nation, great, mighty, and populous.

II. 1. And he went down into Egypt; compelled thereto by the word of God.

2. And sojourned there. This teaches us that he did not go down into Egypt to settle there, but only to sojourn, as it is said, "And they said unto Pharaoh: To sojourn in the land are we come; for there is no pasture for thy servants' flocks; for the famine is sore in the land of Canaan. Now therefore let thy servants dwell in the land of Goshen" (Gn 47.4).

3. Few in number, as it is said, "Thy fathers went down into Egypt with threescore and ten persons; and now the Lord thy God hath made thee as the stars of heaven for multitude" (Dt 10.22).

III. 1. And he became there a nation. This teaches us that the Israelites were distinguished there.

IV. 1. Great and mighty, as it is said, "And the children of Israel were fruitful and multiplied, and waxed exceedingly mighty, and the land was filled with them" (Ex 1.7).

---

[1]Louis Finkelstein, "The Oldest Midrash: Pre-Rabbinic Ideals and Teachings in the Passover Haggadah," Harvard Theological Review, 31 (1938), 291-317.

[2]D. Daube, "The Earliest Structure of the Gospels," New Testament Studies, 5 (1959), 176, 179, n. 4.

[3]I. L. Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah (Leiden: Brill, 1948), pp. 85-86.--S. Stein, "The Influence of Symposia Literature on the Literary Form of the Pesah Haggadah," Journal of Jewish Studies, 8 (1957), 13-44, dates it in the second or third century A.D. but his argument is from silence and is extremely weak.

2. And populous, as it is said, "I caused thee to increase, even as the growth of the field; and thou didst increase and grow up, and thou camest to excellent beauty" (Ez 16.7).

V. 1. And the Egyptians dealt ill with us, as it is said, "Come let us deal wisely with them lest they multiply, and it come to pass that, when there befalleth us any war, they also join themselves unto our enemies, and fight against us, and get them up out of the land" (Ex 1.10).

2. And afflicted us, as it is said, "Therefore they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh store-cities, Pithom and Raamses" (ibid. 1.11).

3. And laid upon us heavy bondage, as it is said, "And the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigor" (ibid. 1.13).

4. And we cried unto the Lord, the God of our fathers, as it is said, "And the children of Israel sighed by reason of the bondage, and they cried, and their cry came up to God, by reason of the bondage" (Ex 2.23).

5. And the Lord heard our voice, as it is said, "And God heard their groaning, and God remembered His covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob" (Ex 2.24).

VI. 1. And He saw our affliction. This refers to the forcible separation from marital intercourse, as it is said, "And God saw the children of Israel and God took cognizance of them" (Ex 2.25).

2. And our toil. This refers to the children, as it is said, "Every son that is born shall ye cast into the river, and every daughter shall ye save alive" (Ex 1.22).

3. And our oppression. This refers to the oppression, as it is said, "Moreover I have seen the oppression wherewith the Egyptians oppress them" (Ex 3.9).

VII. 1. And the Lord brought us forth from Egypt. Not by means of an angel, nor by means of a seraph, nor by means of a messenger; but the Holy One, blessed be He, Himself, in His glory, as it is said, "For I will go through the land of Egypt in that night; and will smite all the first-born in the land of Egypt, both man and beast; and against all the gods of Egypt will I execute judgments: I am the Lord" (Ex 12.12). "I will go through the land of Egypt," I, and not an angel; "And I will smite all the first-born," I, and not a seraph; "And against all the gods of Egypt will I execute judgments," I, and not a messenger; "I am the Lord," I am He and no other.

2. With a mighty hand. This refers to the murrain, as it is said, "Behold the hand of the Lord is upon thy cattle which are in the field, upon the horses, upon the asses, upon the camels, upon the herds, and upon the flocks; there shall be a grievous murrain" (Ex 9.3).
3. And with an outstretched arm. This refers to the sword, as it is said, "Having a drawn sword in his hand, stretched out over Jerusalem" (I Chr 21.16).
4. And with great terribleness. This refers to the visible manifestation of the Divine Presence, as it is said, "Or hath God essayed to go forth to take Him a nation from the midst of another nation, by trials, signs, and by wonders, and by war, and by a mighty hand, and by an outstretched arm, and by great terrors, according to all that the Lord your God did for you in Egypt before thine eyes" (Dt 4.34).
5. And with signs. This refers to the rod, as it is said, "And thou shalt take in thy hand this rod, wherewith thou shalt do the signs" (Ex 4.17).
6. And with wonders. This refers to the blood, as it is said, "And I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood and fire and pillars of smoke" (Jl 3.3).[1]

Here again we have a midrash, for the work actualizes a Biblical text--attributing a specific and presumably relevant meaning to every detail in these verses with the help of other Scripture passages. It is difficult to relate the midrash exactly to its Sitz im Leben, but the famous perversion of 'ărammî 'ōbēd 'ābî ("a wandering Aramean was my father") to 'ărammî 'ibbēd 'ābî ("an Aramean sought to destroy my father") suggests either an effort to conciliate the Egyptian government by denouncing Syria at a time when Palestine was under Egyptian rule,[2] or, much more likely,

---

[1]Finkelstein, art. cit., pp. 295-98.

[2]Thus Finkelstein, ibid., p. 300.

an expression of the anti-Syrian sentiment of Maccabean times.[1] In any event the midrash seems to protest against voluntary immigration to countries outside of Palestine, Jewish assimilation in Egypt, and the Jewish-Hellenistic interpretation of the Bible.[2]

The Palestinian Targums

Whereas the LXX and the Babylonian Targums belong to the literary genre "version," it would be correct to say, as Mlle Bloch suggests,[3] that the Palestinian Targums are much closer to a midrash than to a version. The Palestinian Targums not only offer a version of the Hebrew text but include narrative and other expansions and reworkings of the text in the light of parallel passages. The structure is such that the additional material is presented in the context of the Biblical text and for its sake, in an attempt to actualize the Biblical text, and for this reason one can truly call these targums midrashic.

Narrative Midrash

As we have seen in connection with rabbinic midrash, the

---

[1]Thus Daube (loc. cit.) and Seeligmann (loc. cit.).

[2]See the exegesis of Finkelstein (art. cit.) and Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London: Athlone, 1956), pp. 5-9. So also Seeligmann (loc. cit.).

[3]Bloch, "Midrash," cols. 1278-79; also R. Bloch, "Note sur l'utilisation des fragments de la Geniza du Caire pour l'étude du Targum Palestinien," Revue des études juives, Nouvelle Série, 14 [114] (1955), 6-7. The latter article also conveniently reproduces some targumic fragments.

actualization of a text of Scripture is not necessarily bound to an explicit verse by verse commentary form but can also be accomplished by a rewriting of the original text. This form of midrash is also found in our literature.

A.) The Genesis Apocryphon (GA) from Qumrân would be a perfect example of this "rewritten Bible" type of midrash. Unfortunately the beginning and the end of the work are missing in the scroll that was found, and all that we presently possess of the work is the remains of 22 columns of which only cols. 2 and 19-22 have been published to date.[1] The work is a sort of apocryphal version in Aramaic of the stories in Gn; it is faithful for the most part to the order of the chapters in Scripture, though the narrative in the scroll is in large part couched in the first person. According to the editors[2] cols. 1-5 of the scroll as we now have it deal with the birth of Noah in a manner that has no direct relationship to the brief Biblical account in Gn 5,28-29 but which resembles in the essential points chap. 106 of the Book of Enoch. Cols. 6-12 deal with Noah, the flood, the covenant and the vineyard (Gn 6-9) and cols. 13-18 correspond to the material in Gn 10-11. In this whole section of cols. 6-18 there are many similarities with the corresponding part of the Book of

---

[1] N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, A Genesis Apocryphon. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea (Jerusalem: Magnes Press of the Hebrew University, 1956).

[2] Op. cit., pp. 19-22.

Jubilees. Finally, cols. 19-22 deal with the Abraham story in Gn 12-15. Since, of the published material, col. 2 is badly mutilated, we shall confine our discussion to the Abraham section (cols. 19-22).

The first part of the Abraham account, relating to Gn 12-13, is given in the first person: Abraham tells his own story. This part is rich in embellishments and manifests numerous contacts with the Book of Jubilees. The remainder of the Abraham narrative is told in the third person and, with some notable exceptions, follows the Biblical text more closely. The embellishments and the relation to Gn can be seen clearly in Geza Vermes' study of GA where he has arranged the texts of GA and Gn in parallel columns.[1] The text of Gn is sometimes reproduced verbatim, sometimes paraphrased or summarized, most often expanded into a more lengthy account, but throughout, it is Gn that provides the framework, the plot and the points of departure for the embellishments.

The embellishments are for the most part exegetical and homiletic. They seek to make the Biblical account more real and edifying, and to eliminate problems and answer questions raised by the text. It is an excellent example of the "creative interpretation" which Heinemann speaks of. The method of presentation of the interpretative material is different though from that which

---

[1]Geza Vermes, Scripture and Tradition in Judaism (Leiden: Brill, 1961), pp. 96-126.

we have seen in the pesharim and the Midrash of the Passover Haggadah. The latter set off the interpretation from the Biblical text and in addition sometimes indicated the reasons for the interpretation adopted. GA, however, offers the reader a finished literary composition which does not explicitly state for the reader the motives underlying the interpretative additions. But problems are seen and solutions are being given and the story is being made more vivid, and, while other motives probably lie behind the writing of GA (e.g., the collection and assembling of "oral tradition" on the Genesis figures), the interpretative motive seems to be the primary one from an analysis of what we have of GA at the present time. Some examples will serve to illustrate these remarks.[1]

In some cases the embellishments on Gn serve to make the Biblical account more real and vivid. Thus in 19,11-13 geographical data is given to fill in the Biblical lacuna; in 20,2-8 the summary statement of Gn (12,15) is expanded to explain how the Egyptian princes praised Sarah's beauty, as well as to give the number of princes and the name of one of them. The plagues that afflicted Pharaoh (Gn 12,17) are described and there is added Pharaoh's summoning of magicians and healers, borrowed from the Exodus account (GA 20,16-21). The narration in the first person

---

[1]For a fuller discussion of these and other examples see Avigad and Yadin, op. cit., pp. 23-37; Vermes, op. cit., Manfred R. Lehmann, "1Q Genesis Apocryphon in the Light of the Targumim and Midrashim," Revue de Qumran, 1 (1958-59), 249-63; G. Sarfatti, "Notes on the Genesis Apocryphon," Tarbiz, 28 (1959), 254-59.

also creates a more vivid effect.

Other embellishments serve to make the account more edifying, such as the addition in 20,12-16 on Abraham's confidence in God and in 22,25 on the benevolence of Abraham. Other embellishments seek to harmonize the Gn account with other Biblical texts: hence the mention of Hagar in GA 20,32 (to harmonize with the note in Gn 16,1 that she was an Egyptian maid); hence also the addition in GA 21,15f (to make Abraham take the journey that he was just commanded to take and which the Bible seems to imply that he didn't), and the addition of the escape of the King of Sodom in 21,32 (to explain his reappearance in Gn 14,17). In some cases geographical locations are identified (GA 21,23-25.29). Some additions provide reasons for actions. Thus in 19,10 it is explained why Abraham went to Egypt and not elsewhere: he had heard there was corn in Egypt; in 19,14-17 the dream of Abraham is supplied to explain what prompted Abraham to fear for his life and thus conceal Sarah's identity; and in 20,22-23 it is explained how Pharaoh discovered Sarah's identity: Lot told him.

Finally, the author of GA is at pains to allay any doubts that the Biblical text might raise (e.g., in GA 20,17 it is emphasized that Sarah was protected) and also he seeks to remove anything unfitting in the text (e.g., in GA 20,10 Abraham owes his life to Sarah but not his wealth as Gn states; in GA the gifts come to Abraham in return for his curing the Pharaoh [20,31-33]).

From what we know at present of GA--and we are admittedly at a distinct disadvantage for a discussion of literary form in

not possessing the whole of the work--there is no indication of any motive behind the work other than a desire to actualize the Gn account. The general structure is the Biblical one and is not a foreign one imposed on the material reflecting an intention to write something other than a commentary on Gn. In GA there is no doctrinal thesis in evidence, no indication that there is anything other than Gn itself for the sake of which GA was written. The only peculiarity in GA is the fact that parts are written in the first person. If this were true of the whole work, one might suspect that some desire to write a book of seemingly secret material from of old was the motive behind the retelling of the Biblical narrative. But as a matter of fact the first person is not a consistent feature of the work--GA 21,23 to the end is in the third person--and this suggests merely that the author is more of a compiler than an original writer and that he is assembling previously independent units--and still apparently for no other sake than that of the Biblical text. In fact GA clearly presumes a knowledge of the Biblical text on the part of the reader: in GA 21,5, for example, it is simply stated that Lot parted from Abraham "because of the deeds of the herdsmen"--a reference which would be quite mysterious and tantalizing to one unfamiliar with the original account.

As Vermes remarks, GA is one of the jewels of narrative midrashic literature and the best illustration yet available of this type of midrash in its primitive form. The pseudepigrapha related to it, or perhaps dependent upon it (Jubilees, Enoch),

and most of the later midrashim are too much concerned to graft upon the Biblical story doctrines sometimes foreign to them. Beside GA they appear artificial and labored, even though the weakness of their literary quality is often compensated for by a greater theological richness. But GA, with its simple technique and without exegetical virtuosity and play on words, is a real contribution to the understanding of the midrashic literary genre.[1]

B.) Another midrash similar to GA is Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum,[2] which probably dates from the first century A.D.[3] Here again we find a retelling of the Biblical narrative apparently for the primary purpose of interesting and edifying the reader and strengthening his faith. The method is similar to that employed in GA--some parts of the Biblical text are given in digested form, some parts are embellished upon, although in Pseudo-Philo the additions are much more ample than in GA and clearly extraneous matter with no organic relationship to the Biblical text is introduced.

Non-Midrashic Narratives

Other writers also retold the Biblical accounts, excerpt-

---

[1] Vermes, op. cit., pp. 124-26.

[2] Guido Kisch, Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1949); for an English translation cf. M. R. James, The Biblical Antiquities of Philo (London: SPCK, 1917).

[3] Kisch, op. cit., p. 17.

ing generously from the Scriptures and enlarging upon the Biblical data, but the literary form of these works does not seem to be midrash.

A.) Perhaps the clearest example of this would be Josephus' Jewish Antiquities, especially in the part of the Antiquities that deals with the period from creation to the exile (Bks. 1-10), where Josephus uses as his source the Biblical books as well as a considerable amount of traditional lore on Jewish history. The Antiquities are not a midrash on the historical books of the OT; they do not stand in relation to the Biblical books utilized as for example the GA does to Gn. Rather, Josephus has written a history of the Jewish people. First of all, the Jewish Antiquities are clearly modeled after the Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (as to title, number of books, and in some cases style[1]), and he evidently sees himself as standing in that tradition of writing. Moreover, in his preface he does not indicate any intention of interpreting the Jewish scriptures but states explicitly that he is writing a history (Antiq. I,1) and that the primary motive for writing the work was to inform the pagan world of the history of the Jews (I,3-4), a secondary motive being to show that God blesses those who keep His law (I,14). In order to accomplish these aims he will set forth the details as found in the Scripture record (I,17). Hence the Biblical material

---

[1]H. St. J. Thackeray, Josephus, IV (London: Heinemann, 1930), ix-x.

utilized by Josephus is not looked upon as an object to be clarified and made vivid; it is rather a source from which to draw material. Josephus does not intend his work to contribute anything to the Biblical account; rather it is the Biblical account which contributes to the work of Josephus and therefore the Antiquities are not an example of midrash. Nor should they be classified as midrash because of the traditional and probably fictional embellishments he took from Targums and similar works. This legendary material was very likely used to interpret the Biblical narrative in Josephus' sources in the manner of GA, but Josephus has taken over that same material and used it as data for his history; hence the material ceases to be used in the service of the Biblical text in the Antiquities, and therefore ceases to be midrashic. It is merely data presented in the telling of the history of the Jews.

Does this mean that a literary form is to be ascertained on the basis of the author's intentions? Yes, although this is an inadequate expression of the reality involved. A better statement of it would be that the literary form of a work is to be determined on the basis of the author's intention as manifested in an objective manner in his work. For an author's intention to write in a certain literary form (or in a certain tradition) will inevitably affect the execution of that work and the shape that it ultimately takes. The author may state his aim in an explicit manner in a preface or conclusion or indicate in some implicit manner the context in which his material is to be read, and this

of course facilitates the work of the literary critic. But in addition, as we have seen in the case of the Antiquities, the structure of the work and sometimes even the title, the manner of presenting the material and the manner of handling the sources (although this last is often a very difficult element to analyze) are all shaped by the general intention of the author and are all objective criteria in the work itself for ascertaining the literary form--and these of course become especially evident when the composition under analysis is compared with other similar and dissimilar literary works. Hence through analysis and comparison of the objective criteria, the two methods of the literary critic, the intention of the author may be determined and his intended literary form.

Especially important for some literary genres is the aspect of context mentioned above, for in some cases the literary form of a composition, or an element of it if it is a composite work, is determined entirely by its context.[1] For example, the little story that Nathan tells David in 2 Sm 12,1-4 about the poor man and his ewe lamb is in itself true enough to life to be a narration of fact and indeed is so understood by David at first ("The man who has done this deserves to die"). In the context of ordinary factual speech, then, it would be a factual narrative. When it is put in the context of "You are the man," the same

---

[1]Cf. L. Alonso-Schökel, "Genera litteraria," Verbum Domini, 38 (1960), 1-15.

little composition becomes an allegory. The same story could be put in another context and could conceivably become a parable with a moral lesson for anyone. The story would be textually the same in each case; only the context would change and with it the literary form. In 2 Sm 14 the literary form of the plea of the woman of Tekoa is "drama" and this because the context so determines it (vv. 2-3 for the reader; vv. 13ff for the king). In another context the same words could be a narration of fact. Hence context plays a role in the determining of the literary form of a composition; and this is especially true of midrash. Conceivably both of the above compositions could be prefixed by some appropriate Biblical text and, thus put into the context of a commentary on Scripture, could become a midrash. And in Josephus the embellishments which were once probably in the context of the interpretation of Scripture now are in the context of a history and cease to be midrashic. So the intention of the author as manifested objectively in his work is the object of the literary critic in his work of determining literary forms. The task is not always easy, especially with ancient literature, but in the case of Josephus' Antiquities the objective indications in the work are quite clear.

One further point should be discussed in connection with Josephus. In the course of telling the history of the Jews, Josephus includes material explicitly for the purpose of clarifying what he has said (e.g., he explains the meaning of the name of Adam [I,34]) and to harmonize one part of the Bible with

others (e.g., the hiding of Abel's corpse in I,55) and much is no doubt included by Josephus to make the account vivid and interesting for his readers. Is not this midrash? Is not the legendary material still in the context of the explanation of Scripture and still at the service of the Biblical text? Not really. Because of the nature of the work that Josephus is writing, the material in Josephus in so far as it is exegetical is really exegetical of Josephus' remarks and for the sake of Josephus' account. He is really explaining and making interesting, etc., his own remarks and not the Scriptures. In fact it is presumed that his readers have never read the Scriptures. This is quite different from the operation involved in GA where the reader's knowledge of Gn is presumed and where all indications are that GA is told for the sake of Gn. Josephus is not a literature about a literature as is GA.

It is true that the interpretative material in Josephus could be used as a midrash on the OT by the reader, and perhaps could in this case even be called a midrash, but in this case the reader is giving the Antiquities a new context, one not originally intended by the author from all the indications we have.

B.) Another example of the non-midrashic rewriting of the Biblical text is the Books of Chronicles--pace Robert, Ellis, Bloch and others.[1] The usual reason for classifying Chr as a

---

[1]A. Robert, "The Literary Genres," Guide to the Bible,

midrash is that Chr is an elaboration on and a free handling of ancient texts and traditions in order to edify, teach, and explain. It is pointed out that the Chronicler is an historian and the work is to some degree a history; but it is also pointed out that the Chronicler "selects, emphasizes, and imaginatively embroiders the facts at his disposal and to this degree he is a midrashic author."[1]

It is true that about half of Chr is dependent upon prior Scripture and that the Chronicler has reworked and added to that Scripture and with a certain freedom in some areas--although not in the wholesale fictional manner that some like Pfeiffer would suggest,[2] for today we realize that some of the Chronicler's additions contain accurate historical material. But was the purpose of the Chronicler to fill out the data of Sm-Kgs as GA did for Gn? Is he truly a midrashic author?

The question of the primary objective of the Chronicler in compiling his work is not an easy one to answer. Freedman has

---

2nd ed., vol. 1 (Paris: Desclée, 1960), p. 508; R. Bloch, "Midrash," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, V (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1957), col. 1271; Peter Ellis, The Men and the Message of the Old Testament (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1963), p. 260; H. Lusseau, "Les livres des Chroniques," Introduction à la Bible, I (Tournai: Desclée, 1957), 722-23; L. Hartman, Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963), col. 365; etc.

[1]Ellis, op. cit., p. 260; the same ideas are expressed by the others.

[2]Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (London: Black, 1952), p. 806.

analyzed the structure and themes of Chr and concludes that the principal objective of the Chronicler was to write a history of the dynasty of David, especially its accomplishments in the religious and specifically the cultic areas, and to establish legitimate patterns of institutions and their personnel for the people of God. It is around these fundamental points that the Chronicler constructs his history and theology.[1] (One might also mention another aim: to encourage the readers to attach themselves more strongly to their vocation as the people of God and to encourage them to be faithful to the Law.) Freedman's conclusions are rather convincingly argued. But even if one does not agree with him in every detail, it seems hard to construe the Chronicler's work as anything other than a history and a theology of history quite independent of the Deuteronomic history. In borrowing material from Sm-Kgs and combining it with material from elsewhere, the Chronicler has not sought to make a fuller, clearer, more interesting, trouble-free version of Sm-Kgs and thus to write something for those books similar to GA. He has written a new work, a history of the Davidic dynasty, which has preoccupations which are not those of Sm-Kgs as well as new doctrinal themes which he is attempting to illustrate. The work is structured not on Sm-Kgs but according to the themes of the Chronicler. And all indi-

---

[1]David Noel Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 23 (1961), 436-42.

cations point to the fact that in using material from Sm-Kgs the Chronicler is using them as sources and not as an object of interpretation. He takes selected passages in accord with his interests, sometimes rearranges their order, abbreviates them, supplements them from extra-Biblical sources or his own imagination (and the latter even when there is material on the subject in Sm-Kgs, as e.g., in 1 Chr 21,27-29,30 where the Chronicler speaks of the preparations for the construction of the Temple and the anointing of Solomon but does not utilize the canonical material).[1]

Practically all of his additions to the Biblical text are for the purpose of throwing into relief one doctrine or another that is dear to the Chronicler. Certainly his additions are not for the purpose of clarifying the text of Sm-Kgs or for harmonizing texts, for as a matter of fact the Chronicler introduces traditions that are at variance with Sm-Kgs (e.g., 2 Chr 22,7-9 vs 4 Kgs 9,27-28), and he in no way attempts to reconcile them. He is creating problems and is not solving them as the author of GA did; and the only conclusion that one can draw is that the new traditions are adopted not to clarify Sm-Kgs but

---

[1] A list of the passages the Chronicler selected from Sm-Kgs is given in E. L. Curtis and A. A. Madsen, The Books of Chronicles (ICC; New York: Scribner's, 1910), pp. 17-19. The method of the Chronicler and his use of his sources can be studied most easily in P. Vannutelli, Libri Synoptici Veteris Testamenti (Romae: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1931), and a useful guide for the study is A. Brunet, O.P., "Le Chroniste et ses sources," Revue Biblique, 60 (1953), 481-508; 61 (1954), 349-86.

because they better underline one or another thesis of the Chronicler; they better support his interpretation of Israel's history, and they are used in that non-midrashic context.

It is true that some of the methods used by the Chronicler are the same as those to be used later by the author of GA and the rabbis in their narrative midrashim. But this is not a reason to call Chr midrash, for the same methods are also used by the authors of other literary forms. Selection and emphasis of details are methods used by all historians, ancient and modern; and embellishment with fiction is a method that is also common to several literary forms (e.g., history [in the ancient sense], folklore and didactic fiction, and midrash [if the embellishments are put to the service of a Biblical text]). As Seeligmann has pointed out, many of the techniques used in rabbinic midrash (alteration of traditions, play on words, adaptation of Biblical texts) are found in use in the OT.[1] But they <u>are</u> techniques and can be used for many purposes, and the literary form midrash does not have a monopoly on them. Technique and method, therefore, are not to be confused with literary form--something that has not always been borne in mind in recent midrashic discussions. The literary form of a given work cannot be determined by an analysis of technique alone, and the work of the Chronicler is

---

[1] I. L. Seeligmann, "Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegese," <u>Congress Volume, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum</u> (Leiden: Brill, 1953), pp. 150-81.

a case in point. The Chronicler has indeed used methods that were to be used later in midrashic works and may even have been used in midrashic works in his day, but the Chronicler was not writing a midrash because he was not explaining or actualizing Sm-Kgs. In fact it is doubtful if the reader could even use Chr as a midrash to Sm-Kgs (as he could use Josephus) because of the real difficulties that a comparison of the two would raise in some sections.

Nor should we classify Chr as a midrash because the Chronicler used the Midrash of the Books of the Kings and the Midrash of the Prophet Iddo as sources for his extra-biblical material. As was already shown in Chap. 1, we have no idea of the nature of these two midrashim mentioned in Chron or of the exact meaning of the word midrash in these cases. From the usage of the word midrash at Qumrân we can say that it would certainly be anachronistic to see the technical rabbinic or modern connotation of midrash in Chr. But even if the two midrashim mentioned were something like GA and could be classified under the modern literary category, midrash, this would still not mean that Chr is midrash any more than Josephus is midrash because he borrowed material from midrashic works. The material borrowed would have been at the service of the Bible in the original midrash, but in Chr it is used as data to fill out a new history, one on the Davidic dynasty, and to support the thesis of the Chronicler. The context of the material is now entirely different, and Chr seems to be very close to the type of work Josephus wrote in his Antiquities, a history and not a midrash.

C.) Mlle. Bloch has suggested that Ps 78 is a midrash as well as the other historical psalms (106, etc.).[1] It is difficult to see the midrashic nature of this material too. In Ps 78,5-7 the psalmist states the lex narrationis: "He set it up as a decree in Jacob and established it as a law in Israel that what he commanded our fathers they should make known to their sons . . . that they might not forget the deeds of God but keep his commands" (cf. Ex 13,8; Dt 4,9; 6,20ff; Jgs 6,13). It seems to be in this light that this and other short narrations of Biblical history should be read; and thus Ps 78 and others like it are much closer in literary genre to the credos of Dt 6,21-23; 26,5-9 and to the historical prologue to a covenant renewal (Jos 23 and Neh 9,6-31) than they are to GA. It is true that the historical review in these psalms is selective, is given certain emphases and is embellished here and there in the telling with extra-biblical traditions or with fiction (e.g., Ps 114,4), but, again, these are techniques common to several literary genres. It is true also that the retelling of the history of Israel in these psalms has for one of its purposes the edification of the listener and that the history of the past is presented as an object lesson for the present, but this does not mean that these psalms actualize the Biblical texts involved and are therefore midrash. It would be a very awkward and contrived concept of

---

[1]Bloch, art. cit., col. 1275.

these psalms that would see them as a Genesis-Apocryphon-type work for 50-60 selected Biblical verses of Ex and Nm. The most natural conception would be the one that sees them as recitals of Heilsgeschichte, for it seems clear that it is the events, and not some Biblical narration of the events which are the object of interest.

D.) Another historical survey similar to the historical psalms is Sirach's Praise of the Fathers (44,1-50,24). Siebeneck, following Bloch, calls the Praise of the Fathers an historical psalm but says it should also be called haggadic midrash because Sirach uses Scripture, exploits and reorganizes it to make it an instrument of edification in the light of contemporary needs.[1] It is also pointed out that "midrash is what Sirach himself calls his teaching in 51,23."[2]

First of all, it is not at all certain that the phrase beth midrashi in Sir 51,23 is the original reading (see Chap. 1). If, granted for the sake of discussion, it is original, the word midrash is certainly not used in the modern technical literary sense; moreover it is not correct to say that Sirach calls his book a midrash. If his book is being referred to in the text in question, it is called a beth hammidrash, a school, and in

---

[1]R. T. Siebeneck, C.PP.S., "May Their Bones Return to Life!--Sirach's Praise of the Fathers," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 21 (1959), 416; Bloch, art. cit., col. 1274.

[2]Bloch and Siebeneck, loc. cit.

the light of the usage of midrash at Qumrân, probably a school of Biblical study. This would mean merely that Sirach sees his teaching as the fruit of study and meditation on the Scriptures --and of course Sirach could have presented his Biblical insights in several literary forms (midrash, recital of sacred history, history, wisdom literature, etc.). So the possible occurrence of the word midrash in Sir 51,23 is irrelevant to a discussion of the literary form of any part of Sir; the midrashic nature of any section is to be determined by whether or not the part of Sir under discussion exhibits the primary characteristics of midrash. To this question we shall now turn.

Sirach begins his praise of Israel's ancestors with a statement of purpose (44,1-15) in conformity with the literary procedure of his time.[1] He intends to "praise those godly men, our ancestors" (v. 1), apparently in the same way as others had done: "at gatherings their wisdom is retold and the assembly sings their praises" (v. 15). And at the end of his poem he calls for praise and thanksgiving to God for His wondrous works and prays for a continuance of God's goodness to Israel (50,22-24).

In many respects the poem is like the historical psalms but with two notable differences. First, it is the deeds of God as represented by men which are enumerated, (i.e., individuals are listed and lauded). Secondly, the poem addresses Solomon (47,14ff) and Elijah (48,4ff) in the second person, and for this

---

[1]Siebeneck, op. cit., p. 416.

reason some have chosen to speak of the Praise of the Fathers as a eulogy.

These differences are of interest to note, but they do not seem substantially to change the literary form from an historical psalm--certainly none of them would indicate that the piece is a midrash. No Biblical text is being illustrated. The discussion here is not for the sake of the 30 or 40 Biblical texts in which the heroes' deeds are recounted, any more than that was the operation in the historical psalms. And the fact that the author uses Scripture, exploits and reorganizes it for edification and contemporary needs is not necessarily a midrashic characteristic. This is a technique and not a literary form. The technique may be used to contribute something by way of understanding to a Biblical narrative and this would be midrash. But the technique can also be used to borrow material from Biblical narratives and to construct a composition with other objectives, and this is not midrash. The mentality behind the Praise of the Fathers and the use of this technique is that the things of the past contain a message for us today. Out of this mentality grew several literary forms. It produced such genres as the historical psalms and history when the "things of the past" involved were events and persons. It produced midrash when the "thing of the past" involved was a Biblical text--a more or less fixed literary piece which was the word of God for the past, but for today too if one actualized it with the help of a new composition. There is no evidence that the latter (midrash) was the intended

product of Sirach in his Praise of the Fathers.

E.) Besides the rewritten versions of the Biblical narrative there is another group of compositions which has often been called midrash, i.e., works of didactic fiction such as Esther, Tobit and Jonah.[1] Apparently the sole reason for classifying these writings in this manner is that these works freely elaborate for didactic purposes an historical nucleus of one sort or another. It is hard to see how this type of writing can be called midrash. The book of Esther, for example, stands in relation to no Biblical text, as, say, GA does to Gn--and yet is not this the essential note of midrash? Esther may be a free elaboration on an historical core, and may contain fiction, but that does not necessarily mean that it is midrash. Too often we use the word midrash as a euphemism for Biblical fiction and embellishments, yet fiction occurs in several literary forms (prehistory, popular history, parable, apocalyptic, midrash, didactic fiction, etc.) and therefore fiction is not the determining factor of literary form. The literary form depends on what one does with the fiction, and it is midrash only if one is using the fiction to re-present interpretatively and vividly a Biblical narrative, if one is using it to embellish on a Biblical text. And this is not the case with Esther since Est does not exist

---

[1]Thus Ellis, op. cit., pp. 454-61; Robert, Guide to the Bible, p. 508; Lusseau, "Les autres hagiographes," Introduction à la Bible, I, 692.

for the sake of any Scripture text. If we are to be precise in our classification of literary genres, we should borrow from the rabbis the term haggadah as well as the term midrash and use the term haggadah to describe works such as Est.

We would suggest the same classification for Tobit, even though there is some relation with Gn since some details in Tob have been borrowed from the stories of the Patriarchs. But it is a standard technique of fiction to borrow details from other stories (see Chap. 2); and here it is done to create the atmosphere of Patriarchal times and there is no suggestion in the story that Tb is intended to be a rewritten Patriarchal story brought up to date. It seems to be mere borrowing of details and no different from the other borrowing in Tb--of phraseology from elsewhere in the OT and of details from folklore.[1]

The situation in the case of the book of Jonah is not so clear cut because there is a possibly significant relation with a text: 4 Kgs 14,25 where the prophet Jonah is mentioned. But what sort of relation is it? Did the author of Jon merely borrow the name of Jonah from Kgs, as he did details from the stories of Elijah and Elisha and other material from Jer and from folklore,[2] to compose a bit of free haggadah with a didactic purpose?

---

[1]See D. C. Simpson, "The Book of Tobit," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, ed. R. H. Charles (reprinted ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), I, 187-94.

[2]A. Feuillet, "Les sources du livre de Jonas," Revue Biblique, 54 (1947), 161-86.

Or did the author wish to embellish on 4 Kgs 14,25 in the manner of GA and write a midrash? In other words, is Jon to be read in the context of 4 Kgs 14,25 or not? Or, as it has been recently suggested,[1] is Jon a written sermon in story form based on Jer 18,8 ("If that nation concerning which I have spoken turns from evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do it") since the Jer text is clearly alluded to in Jon 3,10?

Surely if Jonah were found in a rabbinic midrash after the text of 2 Kgs or Jer there would be no question that it would be a piece of haggadah applied to Scripture in order to indicate interpretation or to provide illustration or expansion and would truly be a midrash. But since it is not placed in such a context in the Bible, we must decide if the mere use of the prophet's name or the Jer citation is enough to create that context. The problem is not an easy one to solve, but the present writer would consider the allusions to 2 Kgs and Jer far too weak to give the impression that Jon is a midrash on either of them. One would expect a few more allusions to a particular text if the book were intended to be a midrash on that text. Also the borrowings from elsewhere in Kgs and from folklore would suggest that the name Jonah and the Jer text are simply borrowings in the same spirit. In any event, the point we wish to make here is that it is on these grounds that one should determine whether Jon is a

---

[1] L. H. Brockington, "Jonah," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, eds. M. Black and H. H. Rowley (London: Nelson, 1962), p. 627.

midrash or not--and not on the grounds of the fictional or didactic elements, or because Jon "prolongs the theme of universality found in Jer" as Bloch would have it.[1]

Budde has suggested that the book of Jonah was originally part of the Midrash on the Book of the Kings mentioned in 2 Chr 24,27 and that Jon originally stood after that text in that work but has since been excerpted and stands alone.[2] The suggestion has found little support as one might expect, for there is no evidence to support this assertion nor even to support Budde's presuppositions on the nature of the Midrash of the Book of the Kings (see Chap. 1). In the same vein Winckler proposes that Jon is a fragment of a midrash on all the prophets, the one called the Chronicles of the Seers in 2 Chr 33,19;[3] but again the asser-

---

[1]Bloch, "Midrash," col. 1275. If the prolonging of a theme constitutes midrash, then most of the Bible is a midrash for one reason or another, since much of it prolongs the themes of the Pentateuch and it is not uncommon for later Biblical writers to take up themes of earlier writers and restate or develop those ideas. This prolonging of a theme is frequently done in such a way that it focuses the reader's attention on no particular text of the past and therefore there is no justification to classify such literature as midrash. The prolonging of a theme is a characteristic of many literary genres and is a characteristic that is quite secondary.

[2]Karl Budde, "Vermutungen zum 'Midrasch des Buches der Könige,'" Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 12 (1892), 37-38.

[3]H. Winckler in Altorientalische Forschungen, 2d series, t. 2, fasc. 2 (1899), p. 260f; cited in A. Feuillet, "Jonas (Le livre de)," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1949), col. 1118.

tion is arbitrary. However, granting for the sake of discussion that such was the origin of the book of Jonah, that it once was a midrash because of the context once given it, it is now no longer a midrash because it is no longer in its original context (unless of course one feels that the original context is still preserved by the strength of the allusions to 4 Kgs or Jer).

The Homily of Wisdom 11-19

The last chapters of the Book of Wisdom have often been cited as an example of a Midrash on the Plagues or a Midrash on the Pentateuch, and possibly a midrash in homily form.[1]

Important for a discussion of these chapters is an accurate statement of the structure, for it is mainly from this that we will be able to discover the intentions of the author and the purpose of the composition.

The first problem is whether the composition begins at Wis 10,1 or in chapter 11. Most commentators see a major division of the Book of Wisdom at the end of chapter 9 and propose that the book is to be divided into two parts (1-9; 10-19),[2] or

---

[1]Bloch, "Midrash," col. 1270; E. Osty, Le livre de la sagesse (BJ; 2d ed.; Paris: Cerf, 1957), p. 19; Robert Siebeneck, "The Midrash of Wisdom 10-19," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 22 (1960), 176-82; Guiu M. Camps, "Midraš sobre la història de les plagues," Miscellanea Biblica B. Ubach (Montserrat, 1953), pp. 97-113; K. Kohler, "Wisdom," The Jewish Encyclopedia, 12 (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1907), 539; Samuel Holmes, "The Wisdom of Solomon," The Apocrypha and Pseudpigrapha of the Old Testament, ed. R. H. Charles (reprinted ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), I, 518.

[2]E.g., W. J. Deane, The Book of Wisdom (Oxford: Clarendon,

(more commonly) three parts (1-5; 6-9; 10-19).[1] This division at the end of chapter 9 has the merit of preserving the unity of the review of Israel's history in chapters 10-19 and has of course been so drawn for that reason, but such a division presents one great difficulty: there is a very abrupt change in theme and manner of narration at 11,2. The subject, which has been "she" (wisdom) since 10,1, is suddenly changed to "they" (the Israelites); mention of wisdom, so prominent since the inception of the panegyric on wisdom in chapter 6, ceases (with the exception of a reference to man's wisdom in 14,2 and the isolated reference to divine wisdom in 14,5, both in a digression); the theme of "wisdom

---

1881); J. A. F. Gregg, The Wisdom of Solomon (Cambridge: The University Press, 1909); W. O. E. Oesterley, The Wisdom of Solomon (London: SPCK, 1918); J. Chaine, "Les livres sapientiaux," Initiation Biblique, ed. A. Robert et A. Tricot (Paris: Desclée, 1948), p. 175, and again in the third edition (1954), p. 199. A complete survey of the divisions that have been proposed by the critics can be found in R. H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times (New York: Harper, 1949), pp. 321-22.

[1] E.g., C. L. W. Grimm, Das Buch der Weisheit (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1860); P. Heinisch, Das Buch der Weisheit (EHAT; Münster: Aschendorff, 1912); F. Feldmann, Das Buch der Weisheit (BonnerBibel; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1926); E. Kalt, Das Buch der Weisheit (HBK; Freiburg: Herder, 1938); J. Fichtner, Weisheit Salomos (HAT; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1938); A.-M. Dubarle, Les sages d'Israel (Paris: Cerf, 1946), p. 190; Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 313; E. Osty, Le livre de la Sagesse (BJ; 2d ed.; Paris: Cerf, 1957); J. Reider, The Book of Wisdom (New York: Harper, 1957); A. Lefèvre, "La Sagesse," Introduction à la Bible, ed. A. Robert et A. Feuillet, I (Tournai: Desclée, 1957), 765. --R. Moulton, The Literary Study of the Bible (London: Isbister, 1896), p. 306, suggests a fivefold division: five discourses built on five maxims (1,1; 1,12; 6,12; 9,18; 11,5). These maxims do play important roles in the book but they are not the only significant ones and the division of the book cannot be based on a consideration of maxims alone.

saves her own" begun in 9,18 comes to an end, and a new theme begins: "By the things through which their foes were punished, they in their need were benefited" (11,5), a theme which is still being pursued in 19,5 just before the concluding verses. Stichometric analysis also suggests a division at 11,1. There are an even 500 stichoi in chapters 1-9 (hardly an accident) and 560 in 1,1-11,1. There are 561 stichoi in 11,2-19,22. It seems clear that there is an intentional and strict correspondence in the number of lines between the two halves. Either the intentionally chosen number of stichoi in each half should be 560, or each half has some 560 lines, with 19,22 (two stichs) forming an independent conclusion to the entire book. Chapter 10, then, in form as well as content is clearly a transitional section added to 1-9 in order to build that part of the book into a section of equal length with 11-19; and 11-19, since it served as the norm for the general structure, must have been considered by the author as a rounded literary unit.[1] All objective criteria, then, indicate that the author did not conceive of the review of Israel's history as a unit, that a major break occurs at 11,1,[2] and that Wis is to be divided into two sections: 1,1-11,1[3] and 11,2-19,22.

---

[1]P. W. Skehan, "The Text and Structure of the Book of Wisdom," Traditio, 3 (1945), 1-5. As Skehan notes there is no numerical structure within the two main divisions.

[2]As proposed by J. G. Eichhorn, E. Gärtner, S. Holmes, C. E. Purinton, C. C. Torrey, W. Weber (see Pfeiffer, op. cit., pp. 321-22); Skehan, art. cit., and CCD.

[3]The first section is divided in two parts: 1,1-6,21 and 6,22-11,1. The book begins with an address to the "judges

The second half of the book (11,2-19,22) is divided by some commentators into two parts: up to the end of chapter 15 (the content of which is described in various ways by various authors) and 16-19 (five contrasts between the fortunes of Israel and Egypt: 16,1-14; 16,15-29; 17,1-18,4; 18,5-25; 19,1-21).[1] This arrangement of the chapters, however, overlooks the unity of the whole composition and allows the digressions in chapters 12-15 to obscure the fact that 11,6-14 also contains a contrast between Israel and Egypt.

To better express this unity, a sevenfold division of the whole piece has been proposed,[2] but there is no agreement on how the divisions are to be arranged. This plan would structure the piece on the seven punishments of Egypt mentioned therein and would see seven antithetical diptychs in each of which a punishment of Egypt is recounted and is contrasted with a blessing of Israel:

The plague of the Nile -- 11,2-14

The plague of animals (with a digression on God's mercy and on idolatry) -- 11,15-16,4

---

of the earth" (1,1). This direct address is next repeated in 6,1-11 and again in 6,21 where it appears to mark the end of the section, for in 6,22 the subject changes to the first person and the discussion of the following chapters elaborates on 6,22. A break at 6,21 is also indicated by the CCD.

[1] E.g., Gregg, Heinisch, Kalt, Reider, and A. T. S. Goodrick, The Book of Wisdom (New York: Macmillan, 1913).

[2] Moulton, Fichtner, Dubarle, Pfeiffer, Osty, Lefèvre, Siebeneck; R. E. Murphy, Seven Books of Wisdom (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1960), pp. 130-34.

The plagues of locusts and flies	-- 16,5-14
The plagues of atmospheric conditions	-- 16,15-29
The plague of darkness	-- 17,1-18,4
The tenth plague	-- 18,5-25 (or 18,5-19; or 18,5-19,4)
Death in the Red Sea	-- 19,1-5 (or 18,20-19,22; or 19,5 alone; or 19,1-9; or 19,1-12; or 19,1-21)
Conclusion	-- 19,6-22 (or 19,10-22; or 19,13-22; or 19,22)

Aside from the lack of agreement on the structure from 18,5 on (a fact which raises the suspicion that the sevenfold plan is being imposed upon the material rather than being read out of it), this arrangement of the piece does not recognize the independent nature of 11,2-4 nor does it express the relationship between the maxim in 11,5 and the diptychs. Moreover, 16,5-14 and 19,1-5 do not seem to be distinct sections, while 19,6-22 clearly constitute a distinct section (see below).

The present writer would propose the following structure as the one most naturally suggested by the style and thought of the passage:

INTRODUCTION (11,2-4):	A short narrative of the desert journey (with affinities to Ps 107,4-6), breaking off with the episode of the water from the rock.
FIRST OBSERVATION (11,5):	"By the things through which their foes were punished, they in their need were benefited."

Illustrations

A. 11,6-14: Instead of (anti- 11,6[1]) the plague of the Nile the Israelites received water from the rock.

B. 11,15-16: The plague of little animals. A secondary theme is introduced: "A man is punished by the very things through which he sins" (11,16).

Digression (11,17-12,22): God rebukes sinners little by little so that men may repent (11,17-12,2). A supporting example is given, the Canaanites (12,3-22).[2]

12,23-27: resume the thought of 11,15-16.

Digression (13,1-15,17): Idolatry.[3]

---

[1]It is of interest to note that the preposition anti occurs five times between 11,6 and 19,5. It is first employed immediately after the maxim of 11,5 as the hinge of the first diptych (11,6) and it plays the same role in the next three diptychs (16,2; 16,20; 18,3). It is not used in the fifth diptych, apparently because this section is concerned not with two separate events as are the others but with one event having two results. The fifth occurrence of anti is in 11,15 where it was needed to express the secondary theme of 11,16.

[2]This digression does not begin with 11,16 as Moulton (op. cit., p. 523) suggests, for the theme of 11,16 is not developed in 11,17-12,22. The theme is met again only in 12,23-27 and 16,1, in both cases in connection with repetitions of the thought and vocabulary of 11,15. The theme of 11,16, then, is part of the Egyptian "panel" of diptych B. The writer would acknowledge his indebtedness to Msgr. P. W. Skehan for this insight.

[3]Moulton (op. cit., pp. 523-25) proposes that 11,16-16,1 is all one digression arranged in concentric parallelism:

b 11,16-12,27 - Vermin for vermin worshippers
a 13,1-14,11 - All idolatry is folly
x 14,12-31 - Idolatry leads to corruption
a' 15,1-13 - All idolatry is folly
b' 15,14-16,1 - Vermin worship was the vilest and deserved such doom

It is true that a and a' parallel each other, but b is primarily

15,18-16,4: resume 11,15-16 and 12,23-27 and the plague of little animals instead of which (anti --16,2) the Israelites received quail.

Digression (16,5-14): The Israelites in the desert had animals sent against them too, but it was not a punishment unto death as for the Egyptians; it was only a warning and for a time, and God saved from them.[1]

C. 16,15-29: The plagues from heaven (rain, hail and fire) instead of which (anti - 16,20) the Israelites received bread from heaven.

D. 17,1-18,4: The plague of darkness instead of which (anti - 18,3) Israel received the pillar of fire.

E. 18,5-19: The tenth plague and the exodus "by which you did punish the adversaries and by the same act glorify us" (18,8).[2]

---

concerned with the theme of 12,2 and b' repeats nothing of this discussion. Furthermore, 15,14-17 clearly parallel the vocabulary and thought of a and should be included under a'. Hence there seem to be two separate digressions, 11,17-12,27 and 13,1-15,17. The latter is arranged concentrically:

a 13,1-14,11
x 14,12-31
a' 15,1-17

[1]These verses are a digression and a subdivision of B. Unlike the diptychs contrasting Egypt and Israel, this section begins with the Israelites and not the Egyptians, and it does not illustrate the theme of 11,5. Rather, it anticipates the objection that Israel was punished with serpents too and it shows that this parallel is only apparent. The serpents sent against Israel in the desert were really for an admonition and only for a little while (16,6) and God saved the Israelites from death (16,5.7.11), whereas the locusts and flies (16,9--not a separate plague but a paraphrase of the plague of little animals of section B) killed the Egyptians and it was for punishment. The section is similar to the digression in 18,20-25.

[2]The tenth plague and the drowning in the Red Sea are conceived of as a unit by the author and are not to be divided

Digression (18,20-25): Israel also experienced a plague of death in the desert but not for long: Aaron interceded.

19,1-5: But the Egyptians experienced death to the utmost in the Red Sea. The contrast of 18,8 is repeated as an inclusio: "that thy people might accomplish a wonderful journey, while those might find a strange death" (19,5).[1]

SECOND OBSERVATION (19,6): "Creation was being made over anew . . . that thy servants might be kept without hurt."[2]

Illustrations (19,7-13b)

Digression (19,13c-17): The Egyptians were more inhospitable than the Sodomites.
The renewal of creation was accomplished by a rearrangement of the elements (19,18-21).

CONCLUSION (19,22): "For every way, O Lord, you magnified and glorified your people; unfailing you stood by them in every time and circumstance."

---

into two sections. The two are mentioned together at the very beginning of the section (18,5), and the death of the Egyptians in the Red Sea is seen not as a separate punishment but as the perfect completion of the tenth plague (19,1.4).

[1]Despite the contrast between 19,1 and the preceding digression--"not for long" (18,20); "until the end" (19,1)--it seems best to take 19,1-5 as a resumption of the discussion of 18,5-19. It continues the narrative begun there, and 19,5 forms an inclusio with 18,8. It may be that 19,5 was also intended as an inclusio with 11,5 to mark the end of the first part of the composition.

[2]This clearly begins a separate section and is not a continuation of the exodus discussion of 19,1-5. The following verses (19,7-21) repeat many of the events already discussed (the exodus, the plagues of little animals, the quail, the fire and the water, the manna) and the point of view from which they are all treated is that of 19,6. All of this suggests that 19,6 plays the same role as 11,5.

Wis 11-19, therefore, begins with a short narrative that recalls the desert journey, the battles, and the granting of water from the rock (11,2-4). Apropos of the mention of the water from the rock, the author enunciates a pattern that he detects in the blessings given to Israel in the desert (11,5), and then proceeds, not to continue the narrative of 11,2-4, but to illustrate 11,5 with five examples in each of which the punishment on Egypt is given first and then the corresponding blessing for Israel. The author then makes another observation on the exodus happenings: creation was made over anew (19,6) and he reviews the same events from this point of view. In the conclusion (19,22) he sums up the theme of the whole composition and the aspect from which all has been viewed: God's blessings on Israel. Hence, what at first reading appears to be a rambling, repetitive and loosely arranged composition is actually a work that has been well thought-out and carefully constructed, and one can readily see why the author was so satisfied with it as a literary unit that he expanded 1-9 into a section of equal length.

Wis 11-19 is a perfect example of a midrash. It is a composition that explains the Scriptures and seeks to make them understandable and meaningful for a later generation. The work does not begin strictly speaking with a text but it takes its departure from a short summary of the Scriptural account of the desert wanderings and the first of the blessings given to Israel in the desert (11,2-4), after which one is perhaps expected to

supply mentally an et reliqua. Then with careful attention to the Biblical account of the exodus events it reveals a pattern in those events and explains the reasons for many of the occurrences. In addition, in the retelling of some of the events, the Biblical account is embellished with extra-Biblical and imaginative material to make the accounts more vivid and grandiose and even to support some of the author's observations.[1] If the material in the Book of Wisdom was written for the benefit of Jews in Alexandria who were undergoing persecution, then the midrash also has a hortatory purpose. It recalls for the encouragement of these Jews that once before they had suffered in Egypt and the Lord came to their rescue, and thus the conclusion (19,22) might be termed the application of the midrash. Wis 11-19 might even be called a midrash in homily form as has been suggested, for "homily" is a very apt description of the piece even if it cannot be demonstrated that it was ever written or used as such.[2]

Is not Wis 11-19 essentially the same as Chr though? Is it not a work of history rather than a midrash? Is it not the interpretation of events rather than the interpretation of texts? Like Chr does it not select material from a previous work and set

---

[1]See the commentaries of Osty and Reider, and Siebeneck, art. cit.

[2]Another example of a homily that is a midrash would be Jn 6,31-58, a discourse on the text "He gave them bread from heaven to eat." See Peder Borgen, "Observations on the Midrashic Character of John 6," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 54 (1963), 232-40.

it forth in a new framework with embellishments in order to illustrate new themes and ideas and patterns? The answer to all of these questions is No. A reading of Wis 11-19 has the effect of directing the reader back to the Biblical account of the exodus and shows him a pattern that he may have missed in the narrative; Chr does not do this for any Biblical material. Wis does not retell the whole exodus story or handle it in chronological order but talks about selected events known to the reader from an existing narrative and presupposes a knowledge of the original story and of the rest of the details; Chr presupposes nothing and tells a story that is complete in itself. Wis retains the fundamental plan and conception of the original narrative and points out an old but hidden secondary pattern in the events told therein; Chr simply rewrites events covered in Sm-Kgs from a fundamentally different point of view and according to a new plan. Even though Wis deliberately omits items from and embellishes on the exodus account, there is always careful attention given to the Biblical text and this in order that comments may be made on it; Chr omits from and embellishes on material from Sm-Kgs to provide appropriate material for a new work. Wis embellishes on the exodus account to reinforce the narrative there and thus is interested in events as related in a text; Chr is interested simply in events and goes in search of information wherever it can be found. For these reasons Wis is a midrash and Chr is a history.

Wis 11-19, however, is not a midrash on the plagues. It can now be seen that as a whole the work is a midrash on the blessings of Israel in the exodus event; cf. the point of departure (11,4) and the key verses (11,5; 19,6; 19,22). Or to be more exact, it is a midrash on the episode of the water from the rock in 11,4, the "text" of the sermon. It is true that contained within the homily are individual midrashic sections on the various plagues (the many interpretative embellishments and explanatory comments on them), but the desert occurrences are similarly handled; and the reason for which both the plagues and the other events are discussed is to focus attention on Israel's blessings and on the Lord's fidelity to His people.

Redaction and Glosses

It has been suggested by some that redaction is a midrashic process and that works which are the fruit of redaction are midrash. For example Geza Vermes states: "The final redaction of the Pentateuch, performed in the spirit of the most recent revision, affected, therefore, the significance of the older material, and established the meaning of the compilation as a whole according to the then contemporary understanding of biblical history. This implicit harmonization and interweaving of scriptural tradition may be termed biblical midrash or haggadah."[1] And Vermes illustrates these remarks with a discussion

---

[1]Vermes, Scripture and Tradition in Judaism, p. 176.

of the story of Balaam and shows how P's supplement to the Balaam story puts a pejorative interpretation on the story and makes Balaam a villain.

Pfeiffer in his Introduction to the Old Testament calls later explanatory and interpretative additions to Jos and Sm midrash,[1] and Camps suggests that similar additions in Jgs and Kgs are midrash.[2] In the same vein Bloch proposes that glosses are midrash.[3] Finally, Samuel Sandmel sees the doublets in Gn, Ex, Jgs, and Sm, not as variant traditions, but as examples of midrash: one story is the primitive version, the other a midrashic retelling of it in the manner of GA. Thus Gn 20 is a midrash on Gn 12,9ff; Gn 15 expands Gn 12,1; Gn 21,8-21 is a retelling of Gn 16; 1 Sm 24 is a midrash on 1 Sm 26, etc.[4] As Sandmel remarks: "Were we to find this story [Gn 20] in Genesis Rabbah instead of Gn 20, we would promptly recognize it as a haggadah based on Gn 12,9ff."[5] According to Sandmel we are not dealing with sources blended but with successive haggadic recastings of a single source. Bit by bit over the years embellishments have

---

[1]Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 309, 361, 368-73.

[2]Camps, op. cit., p. 98, n.

[3]Bloch, "Midrash," col. 1276.

[4]Samuel Sandmel, "The Haggadah Within Scripture," Journal of Biblical Literature, 80 (1961), 105-22.

[5]Ibid., p. 111.

been added on to the primitive narrative, neutralizing, correcting and interpreting what was already present. Thus the Abraham of Gn 20 determines and clarifies the character of the Abraham of Gn 12, etc.

First of all, Sandmel's conception of the material in the Pentateuch is hardly credible to the extent that he finds the origin of the doublets in midrashic historiography. Such a theory fails to explain similarities of style, vocabulary, doctrine and interests within the groups of material commonly assigned to J, E, D, and P. Moreover many of the variants between the doublets cannot be explained as interpretative variants on one primitive version of a story; rather there is often a difference in essential detail between the stories--something that looks for all the world like different traditions of the same story. As far as the use of the doublets by the various redactors is concerned as well as the gradual accumulation of details on stories, Sandmel's position is the same as that of Vermes, Pfeiffer, and Bloch, and to this we now turn.

The equation of redaction with midrash is nothing else than the logical result of the confusion of method with literary form, and it clearly demonstrates the error of such a confusion. There is a vast difference between the stages in the composition of a book and a commentary upon that book, between the adapting and interpreting of material and a composition that adapts and interprets another composition. The first is a method that can be used in many literary operations (to assemble oral material

into various literary forms, to put out new editions of such a book, or to write a new work commenting on a former one). The second is a literary work with a specific literary form, and the fact that it uses a certain method does not necessarily allow one to classify under that literary genre other works that utilize the same method.

As Mlle. Bloch rightly notes, the gradual fixing of the sacred text in the post-exilic period was of the greatest importance for the birth of the midrashic genre.[1] Prior to this period of fixation Israel felt free to re-edit her sacred traditions and to add to them and in this way make them relevant to the needs of the community at that time and to bring the traditions into accord with developed religious practices. Once however the sacred text was looked upon as unalterable, successive editions were no longer possible, and yet the need to bridge the gap between the sacred literature of the past and the needs of the present still remained. Thus it was that a separate literature grew up--the midrashic literature--which accomplished by means of works distinct from the Scriptures being commented upon what redaction had accomplished during the state of textual fluidity. There is an organic bond between the redaction of the OT and the early midrash (and this of course is what Bloch, Vermes, et al are at pains to point out), but we should not attempt to

---

[1]Bloch, "Midrash," col. 1268, despite the fact that later in the same article she speaks of redaction and glosses as midrash.

express this organic relation by means of literary genres, grouping under one genre both those works which are the result of several editions and the later interpretative works, solely because both the editing and the later works were interpretative. The interpretative works belong to the literary genre midrash; the final redaction of the Pentateuch (to take an example) still belongs to the same genres (sacred history and pre-history, Torah, etc.) as did the earlier redactions.

For this reason glosses strictly speaking should not be classed as midrash. They are really successive additions (albeit often interpretative) to a book which intentionally or accidently have become part of that book and are absorbed by the literary form of that book. They do not constitute a literary work separate from the text commented upon.

Isolated Midrashic Sections (Based on Explicit Citations)

The later Biblical as well as the Intertestamental literature abound in implicit and explicit citations of earlier Biblical material, and here, within these works of other genres and in connection with these citations, we may expect to find midrash also. But here we must proceed with caution.

It is in this area that Renée Bloch has failed to make some necessary distinctions, and this has resulted in an unfortunate widening of the term midrash in her works and in the works

of those who follow her.[1] Mlle. Bloch speaks of meditation and reflection on Scripture, the reworking and citing of texts and especially anthological style as midrash,[2] and the implication seems to be that almost every citation of Scripture, especially if it is multiple, indicates the presence of the literary form midrash,[3] and indeed the citations themselves seem to be viewed as midrash.

There is, of course, a certain element of truth in the idea and this makes it plausible on first sight. After all every citation of Scripture contains an implicit exegesis since the citation expresses the author's understanding of the text and sometimes even his exegetical methods. Furthermore, all uses of Sacred Scripture can be seen as a result of meditation and reflection on prior texts. An author's ability to cite presupposes some acquaintance with the material and one can presume that a certain amount of thoughtful consideration has been given

---

[1]The same weaknesses are found in the independent work of M. Gertner, "Midrashim in the New Testament," Journal of Semitic Studies, 7 (1962), 267-92.

[2]See Introduction.

[3]Or the "midrashic genre" as she usually (but not always) terms it, to set it off from "midrash properly speaking" which begins with the Palestinian Targum. The terminology, as we have said in the Introduction, is not clear or consistent, but the overall impression from her work is that she speaks of the literary form midrash in connection with her OT examples and not just midrashic methods; and certainly Robert speaks of the literary form, e.g., in "Les genres littéraires," Initiation Biblique, eds. A. Robert et A. Tricot (3d ed., rev.; Paris; Desclée, 1954), pp. 305-09.

to the text prior to its use. Moreover, every citation from the Bible is made because the text is seen as relevant to the topic being discussed; otherwise the citations would be meaningless. Thus behind every use of Scripture in a new composition there lies interpretation, reflection, and the perception of relevancy.

However, there are several important distinctions that must be borne in mind.

1) A text of Scripture may be cited by an author to contribute something to a new composition (as in Chr), or it may be cited so that a new composition may contribute something by way of understanding to the Scripture text (GA, pesharim). The first type of citation may occur in any literary form (even in midrash, e.g., the citations supporting interpretations in the pesharim) but it does not make a composition midrash. The work containing the second type of citation is midrash because of the nature of the composition.

2) Meditation on Scripture can be a pre-literary process underlying the use of citations in a given work so that the Scripture citations may be used to full advantage in the new composition; or the new work itself can be a meditation on a prior text and be written to lead the reader to meditate on that text. Only the latter is midrash, because only in that case are we concerned with a composition and therefore with a literary form.

3) An author can cite a text and, while the text is understood in a certain sense (material exegesis), no emphasis is put on the interpretation and it is assumed that the reader will concur in the interpretation; or an author can cite a text in a certain sense and intend by the way he uses or paraphrases the citation to contribute to an understanding of that text (formal exegesis). Only the latter is midrash since only there does the new composition add to the understanding of the text.

Thus we see that in Biblical citations two directions of movement are possible: either a Biblical text contributes to the new composition and is for the sake of the new composition OR the new composition contributes to an understanding of the text cited and is for the sake of the Biblical citation. Only the latter is the literary form midrash since only there does the composition actualize Scripture. In the former case (which is mere literary dependence) the author may have put attention on a text and made it relevant in his own mind but he does not write a midrash. He merely uses the results of a midrash that he never wrote in his composition of another genre.[1]

It is absolutely necessary to keep this distinction

---

[1]The same situation obtains in the Midrashim, for there the composition is for the sake of the Biblical text, but there are also citations within the new composition whose purpose is to contribute to the new composition. These secondary citations do not necessarily indicate the existence of another midrash on them.

clearly in mind as we discuss the use of Biblical citations, because the works in which these citations are found are not exegetical works where the author's intentions and the nature of the composition are clear from the start. Rather we are dealing here with works in which midrash may be found here and there as obiter dicta, as it were, and the question of the existence of the literary form midrash must be solved on the basis of that distinction if the term midrash is to remain a univocal term and not be made to include both literary form and method and to include every conceivable use of Sacred Scripture.

We shall now exemplify these remarks by a discussion of some texts from the OT and Intertestamental literature. We shall first discuss some passages with explicit citations.[1]

In CD 4,12-19 we find the following passage:

> And in all those years (13) Belial shall be unleashed against Israel;
> as God said by the hand of the prophet Isaiah son of (14) Amoz,
> Terror and pit and snare are upon thee, O inhabitant of the land.
> The explanation of this [pišrô] (is that) (15) these are Belial's three nets,
> of which Levi son of Jacob spoke,
> (16) by which he (Belial) ensnared Israel,
> (17) and which he set [be]fore them as three sorts of righteousness:
> the first is lust,
> the second is riches,
> (and) the third (18) is defilement of the Sanctuary.

---

[1] I.e., those which have an introductory formula, as well as virtual citations which, while lacking such a formula, are obviously intended as quotations. The terminology is Joseph A. Fitzmyer's ("The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," New Testament Studies, 7 [1960-61], 304.).

Whoever escapes this is caught by that,
and whoever escapes that one is caught (19) by this.[1]

Here in a description of the years before the consummation of the end-time we have a citation from Is 24,17. The text itself is cited to contribute to the composition, as a proof-text, but in order for the text to be appreciated it must be explained, so the author proceeds to show how the citation should be understood. He introduces his interpretation with the word pišrô, so that as a result the section looks exactly like an excerpt from a pesher in form as well as in method and content. We would classify 11,14b-19 as a midrash. We have a small composition which seeks to explain a Biblical text. The text is the point of departure for it and that for the sake of which the little composition exists.

We find a similar operation in the following texts--both containing a midrash:

And God remembered the Covenant of the Patriarchs
and raised out of Aaron men of understanding
and out of Israel (3) sages,
and He caused them to hear (His voice) and they dug the well:
The well which the princes dug,
which (4) the nobles of the people delved with a rod.
(Nm 21,18)
The well is the Law,
and those who dug it (5) are the converts of Israel
who went out from the land of Judah
and were exiled in the land of Damascus;
(6) all of whom God called princes,
for they sought Him
and their ⟨glory⟩ is denied (7) by the mouth of no man.

---

[1]The translations of the Qumrân material are largely from A. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit. and/or Fitzmyer (art. cit.) except in those places where we disagree on a major point.

And the rod (the Lawgiver) is the Interpreter of the Law;
as (8) Isaiah said, He has made a tool for His work.
(Is 54,16)[1]
And the nobles of the people are they (9) that come to dig the well
with the help of the Lawgiver's tools,
(10) that they may walk in them during all the time of wickedness,
and without which they shall not succeed
until the coming (11) of the Teacher of Righteousness at the end of days.
(CD 6,2-11)
They who cling to it are (destined) for everlasting life
and theirs shall be all the glory of the Man,
as (21) God has assured them by the hand of the prophet Ezekiel:
The priests and the Levites and the sons IV (1) of Zadok
who kept the charge of my sanctuary
while the children of Israel went (2) astray from me
shall come near ⟨to me to serve me
and shall stand before me to offer⟩ me fat and blood.
(Ez 44,15)
The priests are the converts of Israel
(3) who went out from the land of Judah;
and ⟨the Levites are⟩ those who joined them.
And the sons of Zadok are the chosen (4) of Israel,
the (men) named with a name who shall stand at the end of days.
(CD 3,20-4,4)[2]

In 1QM 11,11-12 we find another midrash although in a different form:

(11) Of old you made ⟨known the sea⟩ son of the power of your hand against the Kittim, saying, And Assyria shall fall by the sword, not of man, and a sword (12) not of man, shall devour him. (Is 31,8)

Here the exegesis preceeds the citation but the remarks are still

---

[1]This text is cited to contribute to the midrash. It is probably understood as referring to the Interpreter of the Law and not just as a general statement--but no midrashic composition is built on it.

[2]Other examples of the same kind can be found in CD 7,9-14. 14-21; 8,9-12; 1QS 8,13-16; CD 19,7-9.

for the sake of the text. The same is true of the following midrashim:

> (13) They are those who have departed from the way; it is the time of which it is written,
> Like a stubborn heifer Israel was stubborn (Os 4,16)
> (14) when the Man of Mockery arose, etc. (CD 1,13-14)

> (11) . . . And all who have been brought into the covenant
> (12) (agreeing) not to come to the sanctuary to kindle a fire on his altar in vain, shall become those who have closed (13) the portal, as God said, Who among you will close its portal and not kindle a fire on my altar (14) in vain? (Mal 1,10)
> (CD 6,11-14)

These citations are quite different from (non-midrashic) proof-texts or fulfillment-texts which are introduced in such a manner that they are not made the object of the discussion but are used as support for what is said. For example,

> (16) So they trusted him; but he seized sixty of them and killed them in one day, in accordance with the word which was written,
> (17) The flesh of thy saints and their blood they poured out round about Jerusalem, and there was none to bury them. (Ps 79,2-3)
> (1 Mc 7,16-17)

The above examples then we would see as small midrashim inserted into larger works of a different genre.

There are other explicit citations however which are not the occasion of a midrash. For example, CD 3,7 Dt 9,23 appears to be cited[1] as part of the narrative:

> (6) Then were (7) their males cut off in the desert. ⟨And⟩ at Kadesh ⟨when He said⟩ to them,

---

[1]The text of CD is corrupt here and it is difficult to say for sure that an explicit citation was intended.

Go up and possess ⟨the land⟩ , (Dt 9,23)
⟨they chose the will⟩ of their own spirit
and did not heed (8) the voice of their Maker.

If there is a citation present, it is clearly a case of a text contributing to the new composition and the citation is not the occasion of a midrash nor of course does it constitute a midrash of itself. Similar examples are found in the following passages:

(9) You [Elias] were taken aloft in a whirlwind,
in a chariot with fiery horses.
(10) You are destined, it is written, in time to come
to put an end to wrath before the day of the Lord,
To turn back the hearts of fathers toward their sons
(Mal 3,23-24)
and to re-establish the tribes of Jacob.
(11) Blessed are those who saw you, etc.
(Sir 48,9-11)

(5) And Tobias began to pray,
Blessed art thou, O God of our fathers,
and bless be thy holy and glorious name for ever.
Let the heavens and all of thy creatures bless thee.
(6) Thou madest Adam and gavest him Eve his wife
as a helper and support.
From them the race of mankind has sprung.
Thou didst say, "It is not good that the man should be alone;
let us make a helper for him like himself" (Gn 2,18)
And now, O Lord, I am not taking this sister of mine, etc.
(Tb 8,5-7)

In all three of these cases the text is of course cited in a particular sense and thus materially exegeted, but there is no indication that the new composition is formally exegeting the texts and being written for that purpose. The same is true of CD 19,1-2:

. . . (the Covenant of God) (1) is for them assurance that they will live for thousands of generations; as it is written, He keeps the Covenant and Grace (2) for a thousand generations with those who love ⟨him⟩ and keep his commandments.
(Dt 7,9)

Here a text from Moses' second discourse is applied to the new

situation of the community ("covenant" is seen as meaning the new covenant with the sect--cf. CD 8,21). Such a use of the text presumes that an interpretation of the text was made by the author but he never wrote out his interpretation--he never wrote a midrash on it. Rather he cites the text so understood as a proof-text, and as it stands in the Damascus Document the text is simply contributing to the new composition. Hence the literary form midrash is not found in these lines. It might be argued that the Damascus Document creates a new context for the citation and that the passage does in fact contribute a new and relevant meaning to the Dt text. However, we do not believe that the structure of the passage would admit of such an interpretation. The wording seems to indicate that the text was introduced as support and that the meaning of "covenant" in the verse had already been assigned.[1]

In the examples cited up to now the midrashic or non-midrashic character of the passages is readily discernible. In some cases, however, it is difficult to decide in which direction the movement lies between citation and composition, and hence it is difficult to decide whether or not a midrash is present. An example would be CD 8,14-18 (=CD 19,26-31 substantially):

(14) But that which Moses said,
Not because of thy righteousness or the uprightness of thy heart

---

[1]Other non-midrashic passages with explicit citations are found in Tb 2,6; Dn 13,53; 2 Mc 10,26; 3 Mc 6,15; 4 Mc 2,5.19; 17,19; 18,14.15.16.17.18-19; 2 Esd 6,55-56; Letter of Arist. 155 and 228; CD 4,21-5,2; 19,15-16; 20,15-16; 1QM 10,1-2.2-5.6-8; 11,5-7.

art thou going in to inherit (15) those nations, (Dt 9,5a)
but because He loved thy Fathers
and because he kept the oath, (Dt 7,8a)
(16) so is it with the converts of Israel
(who) have departed from the way of the people;
because of God's love for (17) the first
who ⟨testified⟩ in His favour
He loves those who have followed after,[1]
for theirs is the (18) Covenant of the Fathers.
But because of His hatred for the builders of the wall
His Anger is kindled.

In this passage the author cites the texts and then goes on to say that an analogous situation obtains in his own day. On the one hand the texts cited may have been merely recalled so that a conclusion might be drawn from them and thus are merely contributing data for the new composition. On the other hand the piece could be understood as a midrashic attempt to apply the ancient text to a new situation to bring out the message that the text should have for the sect.[2]

The same ambiguous situation is found in CD 19,10-14:

(10) They will be saved at the time of visitation.
But the others will be delivered up to the sword
when the Anointed (11) of Aaron and Israel comes,
as came to pass at the time of the first visitation;
as He said (12) by the hand of Ezekiel,
A mark shall be put on the forehead of those who sigh and groan; (Ez 9,4)
(13) but the others were delivered up to the avenging sword,
the avenger of the Covenant.
And such will be the lot of all who enter (14) His Covenant
but hold not firm to these precepts,
when He visits them for destruction by the hand of Belial.

---

[1]The "first" are the first disciples of the Teacher of Righteousness; "those who followed after" are the following generations of sectaries. Cf. CD 4,6-10.

[2]Thus Fitzmyer, art. cit., p. 313.

In 1QS 2,2ff it is again difficult to decide in which direction the movement lies between citation and composition.

> And the priests shall bless all (2) the men of the lot of God who walk perfectly in all His ways, and shall say:
>
> May He bless thee *with all (3) goodness*,
> and keep thee *from all evil* (Ps 121,7)
> May He enlighten *thy heart with understanding of life*,
> and favor thee *with everlasting knowledge*.
> (4) May He lift His *gracious* face towards thee
> to grant thee *eternal* bliss

Here, in a description of the ceremony of entry into the community, we find an embellishment (given above in italics) on the Aaronic blessing of Nm 6,24-26. In a sense the additions are interpretative[1] and the new composition could be seen as a midrash to expand the old text and bring out its implications. It is, however, possible (and much more plausible to the present writer) that the new composition does not exist for the sake of the text but for the sake of a liturgy, and that both Nm 6 and the author (and Ps 121) have contributed something to the formula. This is clearly the case in 1QS 2,8-9 where the same Aaronic blessing is turned into a curse against the men of the lot of Belial:

> May God not favor thee when thou callest upon Him
> and may He be without forgiveness to expiate thy sins.
> (9) May He lift His angry face to revenge Himself upon thee,
> and may there be for thee no (word) of peace
> on the lips of all who cling (to the Covenant) of the Fathers.[2]

---

[1] Thus Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation . . . ," p. 60.

[2] Cf. also the non-midrashic adaptation of Dt 29,17-20 in 1QS 2,11-18. Here too it is a case of a ritual taking its inspiration from an OT text and in no way contributing to the text.

Isolated Midrashic Sections
(Based on Implicit Citations)

In the case of implicit citations there is, of course, the added difficulty of deciding to what extent or degree the use of an OT expression was intended by the writer to carry the impression that a reference to a text was actually being made. In the following examples we give only what we believe to be clear allusions to prior texts, and we note once again that there are two possible directions of movement between citation and the new composition.

Examples of midrash, i.e., examples in which the new composition is for the sake of the citation are found in the following texts:

2 Esd 7,132-40 (on Ex 34,6)

> (132) I answered and said, "I know, O Lord, that the Most High is now called merciful, because he has mercy on those who have not yet come into the world; (133) and gracious, because he is gracious to those who turn in repentance to his law; (134) and patient, because he shows patience toward those who have sinned, since they are his own works; (135) and bountiful, because he would rather give than take away; (136) and abundant in compassion, because he makes his compassions abound more and more to those now living and to those who are gone and to those yet to come, (137) for if he did not make them abound, the world with those who inhabit it would not have life, etc., etc.[1]

1QS 9,19-20 (on Is 40,3)

> This is the time to prepare the way (20) to go into the desert.

---

[1]Cf. D. Simonsen, "Ein Midrasch im IV. Buch Esra," Festschrift I. Lewy (Breslau, 1911), pp. 270ff.

Sir 7,27-28 (on Ex 20,12)

With your whole heart honor your father;
your mother's birthpangs forget not.
Remember, of these parents you were born;
what can you give them for all they gave you? (CCD)

Test. of Naph. 8,8 (on Eccl 3,5)

For there is a season for a man to embrace his wife
and a season to abstain therefrom for his prayer.

Non-midrashic examples, i.e., examples in which the implicit citations contribute to the new composition, are found in the following texts:

CD 5,15-18

(15) For formerly ⟨also⟩ God visited (16) their works,
and His anger was kindled against their forfeits.
For this is a people without understanding (Is 27,11)
(17) they are a nation void of counsel
for there is no understanding among them. (Dt 32,28)
For formerly (18) Moses and Aaron arose
by the hand of the prince of lights, etc.

1QS 1,2

I (1) For [the man of understanding that he may instruct
the sai]nts to li[ve according to the ru]le of the Community;
to seek (2) God with [all their heart] and [all their soul]
[and] do what is good and right before Him (Dt 12,28)
as (3) He commanded by the hand of Moses, etc.

1QS 3,11-12

Then will he please God with agreeable expiation
and it will obtain for him the Covenant (12) of the eternal
Community. (Nm 25,13)

1QS 10,16-17

(16) I will confess Him because He is marvellous
and will meditate on His might;
and I will lean on His favors every day.
I know that in His hand is judgment (17) of all the
living (Jb 12,10)
and that all His works are truth, etc.

Jb 7,17-18

(17) What is man, that you make much of him
or pay him any heed?
(18) You observe him with each new day
and try him at every moment.
(19) How long will it be before you look away from me,
and let me alone long enough to swallow my spittle? (CCD)

Here a hymnic motif from Ps 8,4 is changed into a rebellious statement; the same psalm text apparently also inspired 2 Esd 8,34-35 where it becomes a call upon God's mercy:

(34) But what is man, that thou art angry with him; or what is a corruptible race, that thou art so bitter against it?
(35) For in truth there is no one among those who have been born who has not acted wickedly, and among those who have existed there is no one who has not transgressed.[1]

In some texts there is again a difficulty in deciding the midrashic or non-midrashic character. For example Sirach takes Prv 11,4a

Wealth (hôn) is useless on the day of wrath

and expands it to

Do not rely on deceitful wealth (nksy šqr)
for it will be useless on the day of wrath. (Sir 5,10)

Perhaps it is an attempt to elucidate the proverb and to bring out the full meaning of "wealth" as Prov used it, or perhaps Ben Sira merely took the proverb and used it for his own purposes without intending to focus attention on the original text. Only the former would be midrash.

---

[1] Other non-midrashic passages are CD 1,1.2; 4,18-19; 6,2; Jub 24,31-32; 1 Esd 1,28; 2 Esd 5,35; Enoch 1,2f; 17,1; 62,16; Jdt 16,17; Dn 3,36.38; Sir 20,7; 21,16; 1 Mc 3,18. Also CD 4,19; 8,12.13.18: in these cases values have been assigned to the texts prior to the composition of CD and have become stock formulae; but CD does not assign the values.

Sirach also takes Prv 12,9

> Better a lowly man who has a servant (w'bd lw)
> than the boaster who is without bread

and restates it thus

> Better the worker who has plenty of everything
> than the boaster who is without sustenance. (Sir 10,26)

Here there is the added difficulty of an ambiguous consonantal text in Proverbs. The phrase w'bd lw can be translated "who has a servant" (thus MT) or as "and works for himself" (thus 1 MS, LXX, P). Ben Sira can be merely borrowing from the proverb or he could be explicitly interpreting either of the above readings --and perhaps precisely in order to eliminate the ambiguity.

Anthological Style

Anthological style, according to the definition of André Robert, "consiste à réemployer, littéralement ou équivalemment, les mots ou formules des Écritures antérieures."[1] It is of course well known that this process was frequently used in the post-exilic period in the canonical and non-canonical literature. The post-exilic period brought new problems and needs, and, as we have said, the responses to these needs were sought in the Scriptures. This seeking in and meditating on the Bible often resulted in new compositions which would take up expressions and ideas of predecessors, develop, enrich and transpose the earlier message and thus pass to a new stage of thought while still

---

[1] A. Robert, "Littéraires (Genres)," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, 5 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1957), 411.

speaking in the language of the ancients.[1]

Bloch and Robert and subsequently others have equated anthological style with midrash (see Introduction). They see in it the two basic characteristics of the midrashic genre: meditation on Scripture and the actualization of Scripture for contemporary needs.

From our remarks above on explicit and implicit citations it should be clear that such an automatic equation of anthological style with the literary form midrash is not valid. As with single citations, so also with multiple ones there are two possible directions of movement between a citation and the new work in which it is found. Only if the audience's attention is focused on the prior text and if the new composition exists for the sake of the old text can the work be called a midrash. The borrowing, adaptation and transformation of older material in such a way that the older material merely contributes to the new work as a source (e.g., the possible use of ch. 4 of Amenemope in Jer 17,5-8) is not midrashic. Moreover anthological style can be a process resorted to merely out of a desire to speak in the language of the Bible for one reason or another, and this can hardly be conceived of as an attempt to make earlier Scripture relevant for a later age. Thus in discussing the possibility of midrash in a given passage, one has not exhausted the question when one establishes

---

[1] A. Robert, "Le genre littéraire du Cantique des cantiques," Vivre et Penser, 3d series (1943-44), pp. 201-02; Bloch, "Midrash," col. 1271.

the anthological character of the passage, but one must then carry the investigation further to see whether the anthology is a sign of mere literary dependence or an indication that texts are being cited in order to contribute some understanding to them.

To illustrate these remarks we shall discuss four anthological passages: CD 20,17-21; Bar 2,20-25; 1QM 12; and Ez 16.[1]

CD 20,17-22

(17) . . . But <u>those who are converted from the sin of J[a]c[ob]</u>, (Is 59,20)
who have kept the Covenant of God,
<u>they will then speak one</u> (18) <u>with another</u>
to justify each man his brother
by supporting their steps in the way of God.
<u>And God will heed</u> (19) their words <u>and will hear</u>,
<u>and a reminder will be written</u> [before Him] <u>of them that fear God</u>
<u>and of them that revere</u> (20) <u>His name</u>, (Mal 3,16)
<u>until salvation and justice are revealed to them that fear</u> [God] (Is 56,1)
[<u>And</u>] <u>you will distinguish anew between the just</u> (21) <u>and the wicked</u>
<u>between him that has served God and him that has served Him not</u>. (Mal 3,18)
<u>And He will be merciful to</u> [<u>thousands</u>] (Ex 20,6)
<u>to them that love Him</u> (22) <u>and to them that heed Him</u>,
<u>for a thousand generations</u>. (Dt 7,9)

In this passage we have a midrashic use of anthological style. The passage first of all identifies the <u>šby pš'</u> of Is 59,20 with

---

[1] The Canticle of Canticles has been termed a midrash because of the allegorical character it possesses from the alleged anthological process used in its composition (Bloch, "Midrash," col. 1273, based on the works of A. Robert and A. Feuillet on the Canticle). The arguments for the existence of <u>style anthologique</u> in the Canticle are extremely tenuous (cf. R. E. Murphy, "Recent Literature on the Canticle of Canticles," <u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u>, 16 [1954], 5-8).

those "who have kept the Covenant of God" (the sect). It then goes on to identify the sect with the "they," "them that fear God," and the "you" in Mal 3,16.18 (which is apparently seen as a prophetic text). If the allusion to Is 56,1 is intended, then the text also states that the sect will be the recipient of the promises of Is 56,1. The repetition of the phrase "them that fear God" in line 20 supports this interpretation of the use of the Isaian quotation. The subsequent citations from Ex and Dt merely contribute to the new composition. They may have been understood as referring to the sect but CD does not point up that aspect. It merely cites them in a certain sense and uses them for what they can contribute to the work.

Bar 2,20-25

(20) For thou hast sent thy anger and thy wrath upon us, as thou didst declare by thy servants the prophets, saying: (21) "Thus says the Lord: Bend your shoulders and serve the king of Babylon, and you will remain in the land which I gave to your fathers. (22) But if you will not obey the voice of the Lord and will not serve the king of Babylon, (23) I will make to cease from the cities of Judah and from the region about Jerusalem the voice of mirth and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, and the whole land will be a desolation without inhabitants." (24) But we did not obey thy voice, to serve the king of Babylon; and thou hast confirmed thy words, which thou didst speak by thy servants the prophets, that the bones of our kings and the bones of our fathers would be brought out of their graves; (25) and behold they have been cast out to the heat of day and the frost of night. They perished in great misery by famine and sword and pestilence.	(Jer 36,7) (Jer 27,11.12) (Jer 7,34) (16,9; 33,11) (Jer 33,10) (Jer 8,1) (Jer 36,30) (Jer 14,12; 38,2

This is another example of the midrashic use of anthological style. Here, however, it is not a question of exegeting prior texts but of calling them to mind and showing that they have been fulfilled. The texts are so arranged and presented that the effect of the passage is to recall the old prophecies and show their relevance for understanding a present situation. Similar examples can be found in Bar 2,27-35 and Dn 9,1-19.

1QM 12

This column is a veritable mosaic of Biblical citations (over twenty-eight texts have been used) and it is a good example of the non-midrashic use of anthological style. The column is the lyrical passage terminating the discourse which the author of 1QM puts on the lips of the High Priest:

XII (1) For the multitude of the saints in heaven is [Thin]e (?) and the hosts of angels in Thy holy realm/to pr[aise] Thy [Name].	Is 63,15/ Ps 142,8
And the elect of the holy people (2) hast Thou set for Thyself upon [ea[rth] [and the b]ook of the names of all their host is beside Thee in Thy holy abode,	Ps 68,6 or Dt 26,15
and the [. . .] of the [. . .] in Thy glorious realm; (3) and the favours of [Thy] blessi[ngs are for them] and Thou hast engraved for them Thy Covenant of peace with the burin of life,	Num 25,12 or Sir 45,24
that [the sons of light (?)] may reign in all the times of the ages (4) and that Thy [e]lect may chastise [their] adv[ersaries] (ranked) according to their Thousands and their Myriads together with Thy saints and angels; and that they may inherit a stele (?) (5) in the battle	

[and may smite] the rebels of the earth by Thy great judgments,
and that [they may triumph] together with the elect of heaven.
(7) And Thou art a ter[rible] God/in Thy kingly glory — Dt 7,21/ Ps 145,11
and the congregation of Thy saints is in the midst of us (for) fina[l] succour.
[Among] us (is) contempt for kings,
disdain (8) and mockery for the brave!
For Adonai is holy — Ps 99,9
and the King of Glory is with us, the people of the saints. — Ps 24,7-10/ Dn 8,24 or 7,27
The pow[ers] of the host of angels are among our numbered men
(9) and the Valiant of Battle is in our congregation — Ps 24,8
and the host of his spirits accompany our steps.
And o[ur] horsemen are [like] the clouds — Ez 38,9 or 16 and
and like the mists of dew which cover the earth — Is 18,4
(10) and like the shower of rain — Is 28,2 (with modifications)
which waters in the desired way all its fruits. — and Is 34,1

Arise, O Valiant One!
Lead away Thy captives, O glorious Man! — Jgs 5,12
Do (11) Thy plundering,/O Valorous One! — 5x in Bible/ 10x in Bible

Set Thy hand upon the neck of Thine enemies — Gn 49,8
and Thy foot upon the heap of the slain! — Dt 33,29(?)
Strike the nations Thy enemies — Nm 24,8
and let Thy sword (12) devour guilty flesh! — Dt 32,42
Fill Thy land with glory — Is 6,3 (change in pointing)

and Thine inheritance with blessing!
A multitude of cattle in Thy pastures, — Jer 49,32
silver and gold and precious stones (13) in Thy palaces! — Is 54,12
O Zion, rejoice greatly!
Appear amid shouts of joy, O Jerusalem! — Ps 97,8 (or 98,12) and Za 9,9

Exult, O all you cities of Judah! — Ps 97,8 (or 98,12)

Open (14) [thy] gat[es] for ever
for the riches of the nations to enter in! — Ps 24,7 or 9 and Is 60,5

And let their kings serve thee — Is 60,10
and let all thy oppressors bow down before thee — Is 60,14

and (15) [let them lick] the dust [of thy feet]	Is 54,23
[O daughters] of my people,/break out in cries of gladness.	15x in Bible/ Is 48,20 or Ps 42,5 or 47,2
Adorn yourselves with magnificent ornaments	Jer 4,30 (cf. Ez 23,40)
and rule over the [ki]ng[dom . . .]	
Kingship shall be God's	Abd 21
and Israel will be an eternal kingdom	Ps 145,13[1]

Evidently the author did not wish to attempt a personal composition for this section, but rather sought to construct an anthology of phrases so that the whole work, carefully pieced together, might share in the vigor, solemnity, and grandeur of the pieces that inspired it. So fond was the author of his work that he reproduced 11.8-16 again in Col. 19.

By no stretch of the imagination could this passage be conceived of as contributing to any sort of understanding of the original texts, or even of some of the texts. Not only the number of texts cited but also, and especially, the way they are used clearly indicates that it is a case of prior texts serving as a source and contributing terminology and atmosphere to a new composition.

Ez 16

In the course of her article on midrash in the Diction-

---

[1]For the textual analysis see Jean Carmignse, "Les Citations de l'ancien testament dans 'La Guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres,'" Revue Biblique, 63 (1956), 254-60; idem, La Règle de la guerre (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958), pp. 171-87.

naire de la Bible, Supplément, Renée Bloch indicates a large number of Biblical examples of midrash and the midrashic genre or process, as she variously terms it. Confined to a brief treatment of each text in the Dictionnaire, she could, however, set forth only the conclusions of her own literary analysis of each text. Consequently, to illustrate in greater detail these summary indications, she later chose to publish in a separate article the complete analysis of one such text, Ez 16, which she sees as a perfect example of the midrashic process in the Bible, and thus because of its anthological character.[1] Since she has put such emphasis on this passage and since it provides a convenient text for a critique of her views, we shall discuss this passage in some detail.

Mlle. Bloch dates the allegory of Ez 16 from the first years of the Babylonian exile.[2] According to her a study of the vocabulary of the chapter shows general contacts with Dt and Jer as well as with P, and these words and phrases (13 in all)[3] are not mere linguistic similarities but are terms bound to themes that are common to Ez and to the literature mentioned,

---

[1]Renée Bloch, "Ézéchiel XVI: exemple parfait du procédé midrashique dans la Bible," Cahiers Sioniens, 9 (1955), 193-223.

[2]Ibid., pp. 194, 213.

[3]Ibid., pp. 198-203. Riqmâ (v. 10), tāhaš (10), bim'ōd me'ōd (13), lᵉrêaḥ nîḥōaḥ (19), wᵉrāgᵉmû (40), lᵉhak'îsênî (26), gillûlê (36), wᵉšābtî et-šebîtᵉhen (53), tô'ăbōtèhā (2), bᵉha'ăbîr 'ōtām lāhem (21), gō'elet (45), ḥay-'ānî (48), lᵉhāpēr berît (59).

and only to these writings, so that on this basis alone there is suggested the existence of a close relationship between these groups of material.

More important, however, than these general similarities of vocabulary, says Bloch, are the similarities in thought between Ez 16 and Os (2; 8,1-9,10), Jer (3; 12,7-17), and Dt (4, 1-31; 8,11-20; 32).[1] It seems clear that Ezechiel, in composing his allegory, borrowed on the one hand from Os and Jer (completing the former in many points by the latter) the image of the unfaithful wife, and on the other hand from Dt the themes of the Covenant and the jealousy of God. The contrast between the splendor of His gifts and the infidelity and ingratitude of the wife comes from Os and Dt 8. And not only did Ezechiel get his general themes from these texts but also details of his allegory. Ezechiel and Osee both have an accusing mission (Ez 16,2; Os 2,4). The wife in both texts has from her prior history a penchant for infidelity (Ez 16,3-8; Os 1,2). She runs after her lovers and not vice versa (Ez 16,33-34; Os 2,7 and 9). She is accused of having failed to appreciate the gifts of her spouse and of having attributed them to herself or to her lovers (Ez 16,15ff.; Os 2,7 and 10; 9,1, etc.), of having taken Yahweh's gifts of gold and silver to make idols (Ez 16,17; Os 2,10; 8,4) and his other gifts to offer in their honor (Ez 16,18-19; Os 2,15) and

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 203-12. There are other texts that could be mentioned, Bloch admits, but these are the main ones.

to make political alliances (Ez 16,33; Os 8,9-10). She is accused of having forgotten "the days of her youth" Ez 16,22 and 43; Os 2,15.17). To correct her Yahweh begins by depriving her of the abundance of her nourishment (Ez 16,27; Os 2,11). The wife will then be stricken, despoiled, humiliated before her lovers and before the peoples whose idols she adored (Ez 16,35-43; Os 2,5.11-15). And in both texts the prophecy ends with the assurance that Yahweh will retain his love for her and pardon her (Ez 16,63; Os 2,16-21) and renew his covenant with her (Ez 16, 60-62; Os 2,18-25).[1]

A comparison with Jer 3 shows the following common features: the lovers are called "strangers" (Ez 16,32; Jer 3,13) and are denounced in the same tone in Ez 16 as in Jer 3,1-2. She has played the harlot on the mountains and by the waysides (Ez 16,15.23-29; Jer 3,2). She it is who seeks out her lovers (Ez 16,24-25.31-34; Jer 3,2). She has sacrificed her children to idols (Ez 16,20-21.36-38; Jer 3,24). The infidelities of Israel are recounted (Ez 16,45-47; Jer 3,6) to show that the sin of Judah is greater (Ez 16,51-52; Jer 3,7-12) and that, compared to Judah, Israel appears just (Ez 16,51; Jer 3,11). Israel and Judah will be reunited and reestablished (Ez 16,53-55; Jer 3,18).

---

[1] We have omitted the following parallels noted by Bloch because we fail to see the common theme indicated: Ez 16,15ff., 23-29 / Os 2,4.7 (denunciation of debaucheries in the same tone and with the same vigor); Ez 16,60-62, etc. / Os 2,15 (the wife has forgotten Yahweh); Ez 16,60 / Os 2,22 (Yahweh will remain faithful to his espousals, to His covenant).

Yahweh will be merciful (Ez 16,63; Jer 3,12).

In Ez 16,8-38 the idea of the covenant is formulated along the lines of Dt 4,20 and 24; 8,18; and the jealousy of God as set forth in Dt 4,23-24 is expressed in several ways in Ez 16,15-22.26.32.42-43.59. In Ez 16 the sins of Israel are prostitutions (as in Os 2,4; 9,1; Jer 3,6, etc.) and adulteries (as in Os 2,4; Jer 3,8.20, etc.) with her lovers (Os 2,7; 8,9, etc.) who are the Baals (as in Os 2) and the pagans (as in Os 8). Thus her land will be ravaged (Ez 16,38-41; Jer 12,7-13; Dt 4; 8).

And finally there are themes and elements of Ez 16 common to the beginning of the Canticle of Moses (Dt 32): general reproach (Ez 16,2; Dt 32,5-6), recall of the past (Ez 16,3-14; Dt 32,7-14) in which there are several parallels: Yahweh finds and cares for Israel in the solitude of the field or the desert (Ez 16,6-9; Dt 32,10-11) and heaps kindness on her (Ez 16,10-14; Dt 32,12-14), and Israel owes all this to Yahweh alone (Ez 16,5; Dt 32,12). Prosperity follows and God is abandoned (Ez 16,15; Dt 32,15). All the aspects of Israel's sin are listed--jealousy, irritation, abominations, sacrifice to idols, the forgetting of Yahweh (Ez 16,16-34; Dt 32,16-18). Yahweh decides to punish (Ez 16,35-43; Dt 32,22ff.). Yahweh "provokes" Jerusalem and "stirs up her jealousy" (Ez 16,44-58; Dt 32,21). Yahweh will be faithful and merciful (Ez 16,63; Dt 32,4.36).

Moreover, the whole of Ez 16 follows closely the events of Israel's history as related in Gn-Kgs (v. 3, the sojourn of

the Patriarchs; 6, the covenant with Abraham; 7-8, the covenant with Moses, etc.).

At first glance Ez 16 seems to possess considerable originality, but after such literary analysis we see that a large part of the work consists of literary elements pre-existing in the biblical tradition.

The earlier material, however, is not used woodenly but has been changed and adapted to Ezechiel's literary form, to new historical circumstances and to the demands of doctrinal developments. Thus in Ezechiel's historical allegory there is a long description of the origins of Jerusalem which would not have found a place in Osee's perspective or in the non-allegorical literary genre of Osee and Jeremiah. Dt 32 ends with a promise of deliverance from the hands of the people whom Yahweh will use to punish Israel, whereas in the historical situation of Ezechiel the promise is of a re-establishment and a new covenant. Ezechiel takes ideas of the covenant from Dt (a gratuitous exclusive bilateral pact with the jealous God), and from P (emphasis on unilateral character). From Os he takes the image of the spouse which was implicitly associated with the idea of covenant. Then Ezechiel combines these elements and for the first time sets forth the whole content of the idea of the covenant in terms of conjugal exclusiveness and intimacy. He then corrects this image which could be understood in too bilateral a way by the allegory of the child, found, saved, beautified by gratuitous, prevenient love. Ezechiel thus gives a more personal character

to the relation between God and His people and has deepened the theological content by putting into new relief the absolute priority of the love of God and the totally gratuitous character of His favor. And in connection with this Ezechiel also reverses the traditional order of the terms "return to God"--"pardon." Contrary to his predecessors Ezechiel sees repentance not as the condition of pardon, but as the fruit of a gratuitous pardon which proceeds from a merciful love (Ez 16,59-63; cf. 36,24-31).

One can see then how former texts were reused anthologically and at the same time completed and clarified one by the other, and transposed to insist more vigorously on certain points that were less clear in the sources. Thus an original work is produced that delivers a new message to answer the needs of the time--that period of spiritual confusion at the beginning of the exile. And thus the catastrophe of the exile is explained by rethinking the past history and the significance of the great events in the light of the present situation.

It seems that all the characteristics of the midrashic genre are found in this text. According to Bloch we have a reflection on preexisting sacred texts, an anxious inquiry into the documents of the past for the light, answers, explanations, assurances, and hopes that the present somber moment demands. To accomplish this Ezechiel juxtaposed certain texts from Os, Jer, and Dt to clarify, explain, and complete them one by the other, to make them react in some way one on the other so as to bring out not a different meaning from that of the past but a

developed one adapted to the needs of the present situation. Ez 16 then furnishes a most significant example of the midrashic process or genre which would in the course of the post-exilic period develop into rabbinic midrash.

It should be noted first of all that, while this passage may be termed anthological (with Bloch), it is not anthological style in the restricted sense of that term, i.e., the use, literally or equivalently, of words or formulae of earlier Scripture. There is little of this operative in the passage. (Hence the lack of supporting textual analysis.) It is mostly an anthology of ideas and images. Perhaps the term anthological is still apt, perhaps not, but we do wish to point out in what way the term was used by Bloch.

We readily admit the literary dependencies pointed out by Bloch. Most of them had been indicated before, at least in a general way, by Millar Burrows[1] and the main ones by the commentators. Rather, the problem facing us is to determine whether these prior texts were taken up to focus attention on them and to actualize them for Ezechiel's contemporaries, or whether Ezechiel merely took ideas from them to construct his own composition. In other words, does Ez 16 contribute to an understanding of the prior texts (midrash), or do the prior texts

---

[1]Millar Burrows, The Literary Relations of Ezekiel (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society Press, 1925), pp. 6, 7, 11, 13, 19, 23-24.

contribute to Ez 16 (literary dependence)? If the former obtains, then it would seem that there should be something clearly alluding to specific texts and that the discussion in Ez 16 should be in some way limited and controlled by the details of these earlier texts. If there are no clear allusions and if there are too many differences between Ez 16 and the other texts, then I believe we can safely conclude that Ezechiel has gone his own way, taking what is useful where he finds it, but in no way attempting to make specific, earlier oracles relevant for his generation.

Millar Burrows has stated that Ez 16 certainly recalls the utterances of Ezechiel's predecessors, but that it is hard to say if this is intended or unconscious.[1] With regard to this remark, let us say first of all that such a judgment certainly indicates that the situation is by no means so clear as Bloch would have it. Secondly, in place of Burrows' two alternatives we would envision four possibilities: intended reference to earlier texts, conscious borrowing, unconscious borrowing, no borrowing but similar topic. In our judgment there are not enough similarities between Ez 16 and the prior texts to warrant seeing intended reference. In some cases there are too many similarities to allow for unconscious borrowing or no borrowing at all, and the text of Ezechiel seems to indicate conscious

---

[1] Ibid., p. 14.

borrowing of prior material with no intent to call attention to these prior texts for the purpose of commenting on them or applying them. In other cases a common topic seems to account for any similarities. While there is inevitably an element of subjectivity involved in such a judgment, nevertheless the position is based on the data contained in the following considerations.

First of all, Dt 4 and 8 may provide the general background and theology for Ez 16 just as they did for Osee and Jeremiah. But there are no allusions in Ez to call Dt 4 and 8 specifically into mind as texts, any more than the review of the history of Israel in Ez 16 calls into mind any specific narrative texts. If Ezechiel is commenting on anything, he is commenting on well-known events in the history of Israel as seen in the light of the common theological notion of a covenant with the jealous God, and he is not interested in a particular narrative of these events. Hence we see no grounds for calling Ez 16 a midrash on the texts of Dt 4 and 8. They are not cited nor is anything contributed to an understanding of them.

With regard to Os 8,1-9,10 there are but four verses with any similarity to Ez 16: "With their silver and gold they made idols" (Os 8,4c); "For they have gone up to Assyria, a wild ass wandering alone, Ephraim has hired lovers. Though they hire allies among the nations . . ." (8,9-10a); "You have played the harlot, forsaking your God. You have loved a harlot's hire upon all threshing floors" (9,1); "Like grapes in the wilderness, I found Israel" (9,10). The ideas of the rest of the passage

are not used at all so it is difficult to see how Bloch could say that the whole oracle is being alluded to. With regard to the four verses that do bear a resemblance to Ez, merely the ideas have been used; there are no verbal allusions ("silver and gold" [v. 4] is hardly distinctive enough to be one) nor are the details of Os used ("threshing floor" [Os 9,1], "wilderness" [Os 9,10]). (The wild ass image, of course, would not fit the wife-image of Ez.) Indeed, so weak are the allusions to Os 8-9 that one wonders whether the "silver and gold" in Ez 16 is from Os 8,4c or from Os 2,10; whether the harlot image is from Os 9,1 or from Os 2 and Jer 3; whether the finding of Israel is from Os 9,10 or from Dt 32,10. Surely there is little evidence to support the theory that Ez is calling attention to these verses so that he might apply them to his generation and contribute to an understanding of them. It would be difficult even to establish literary dependence upon them.

In Jer 12,7-17 there is the prophecy on the ravaging of the land, but aside from this general idea being developed in Ez 16,38-41 there is nothing in Ez 16 to call this particular passage from Jer into mind as a text to be applied to Ezechiel's audience. As a matter of fact, the images in the two passages are quite different. Ezechiel does not explain Jer or provide new insight into it. And here again it would be hard to prove even the minimum situation of literary dependence, because Ezechiel's source for this idea may well be Os 2.

There are certainly similarities between Dt 32 and Ez

16, especially in Dt 32,10-15 but again it appears to be a situation where Dt 32 has contributed elements to Ez 16, and where there is little indication that Ezechiel was citing Dt 32 as a text and applying it to his generation. In both Ez and Dt Yahweh finds Israel in the wilderness ("desert" in Dt; "field" in Ez!) and provides oil and honey; Israel becomes sleek and forgets God, and there follow the sins, the jealousy of God, and the punishments and forgiveness. But there are many changes of detail, most, it must be admitted, due to the fact that Ezechiel develops the ideas in the imagery of the faithless wife, but not all. What Ezechiel seems to have done is to have taken the general plan of Dt 32 and a few details and used them in his development of another image. And, indeed, one wonders how much Dt 32 has really contributed by way of general plan to Ez 16 and how much similarity in pattern is due simply to the fact that both passages are recounting the relations between Yahweh and Israel, and the fact that sin, jealousy, punishment, and forgiveness are bound to be the pattern in any such passage. And aside from the general pattern, there is really nothing to suggest Dt 32,16-43.

Bloch proposes that Ez 16,44-58 is a sort of exegesis or actualization of Dt 32,21: "They have stirred me to jealousy with what is no god; they have provoked me with their idols. So I will stir them to jealousy with those who are no people; I will provoke them with a foolish nation." Thus in Ez 16,44-58 Yahweh provokes and incites jealousy in Jerusalem by showing that her

infidelity surpasses that of her sisters whom she despises and whom she does not consider as a people (of God).

It is true that Yahweh is provoked to jealousy in Ez 16,15-43. However, nothing in Ez 16,44-58 explicitly or implicitly refers to the jealousy and provoking of Jerusalem, or to the "no people" and "foolish nation" of the Dt text. The whole of the section in Ezechiel is written to inspire shame (v. 52) not jealousy, and one wonders if Samaria in the time of Ezechiel was seen as not being a people of God. For a possible midrash of this sort on Dt 32,21 cf. Sir 50,25-26.

> My whole being loathes two nations,
> The third is not even a people:
> Those who live in Seir and Philistia,
> and the foolish nation who dwell in Sichem.

Here we may have an allusion to the text of Dt and an interpretation of an element in it for a later age. We fail to see how Ez 16 does the same for Dt 32.

In the case of Jer 3 and Os 2, we are dealing with texts whose main image is substantially the same as Ez 16--the faithless wife--and here, to be sure, the very image in Ez as well as numerous similarities in thought and details call to mind these prior passages and dispense with any need for verbal allusions to do so. The question still remains though whether Ezechiel intentionally refers to Jer 3 and Os 2 in order to show how these oracles apply to his audience, or whether he has merely borrowed from them or from a common tradition. We believe it is a case of borrowing because alongside the similarities between Ez 16 and the two former oracles, there are many dissimilarities and they

are not due to a different image as was the case above. For example, in Jer 3, vv. 1, 3, 4, 5, 14, 15-17, 19, and 21-25 contain images and ideas that are not found in Ez. Moreover, the whole passage is a plea for repentance whereas Ez 16 is an announcement of coming punishment. It would seem that, if a text is being applied to a later generation, at least the general trend of thought ought to be retained and applied, to say nothing of the details.

In Os 2 we have a threatening and accusing passage as in Ez and many similarities between the two, but here again there are also many differences: Yahweh's gifts of wool, flax, water, and drink (Os 2,7) do not appear in Ez. In Os the silver and gold (and perhaps the grain, wine, and oil) are "used for Baal" (v. 10), and the wife puts on her ring and jewelry to go after the Baals (15); whereas in Ez the jewels, gold, and silver are made into idols and the idols are covered with the garments and the rest is offered to them (17-19). In Os the wife does not know Yahweh gave her the gifts (7.10.14) whereas in Ez she seems to be aware of it and this makes her crime more heinous. The children of the wife will receive no pity in Os (6); in Ez they have already been sacrificed by the mother (20-21). In Os the wife forgets Yahweh (15); in Ez she does not remember the days of her youth when she was naked (22). In Os Yahweh punishes by taking away the food and gifts (11); in Ez he diminishes her allotted portion (land--an historical allusion) (27). The wife cannot find her lovers and says she will return to her husband

(Os 2,9); in Ez there is no parallel. In Os Yahweh will hedge her up with thorns and build a wall against her (8) and will make her a wilderness, a parched land, and slay her with thirst and put an end to her feasts and sabbaths (5.13.14); in Ez the enemy will burn her houses (41). In Os Yahweh will bring his wife into the wilderness and recapture the days of her youth (16-17) but there is no mention of this in Ez. In Os Yahweh promises that he will make a covenant with the beasts and birds and animals and will espouse Israel to him forever (20-22); in Ez the marriage image is dropped and only a new covenant with Jerusalem is spoken of (60-62).

In view of these differences between Ez on the one hand and Jer and Os on the other the writer feels that it is very difficult to conclude that Ez is focusing attention on these prior texts with a view to actualizing them by his own allegory. It would seem that, if the prior texts were the point of primary interest, they would have more strongly determined the details of Ezechiel's composition, whereas the evidence seems to indicate that Ezechiel has taken analogies between Israel and a faithless wife as found in earlier oracles and tradition, has utilized details found here and there, created others, and has constructed a new and very detailed allegory on Israel's history. It would seem that Ezechiel is doing what Osee and Jeremiah did --<u>interpreting history and events</u>, but that he is not contributing to an understanding of the earlier oracles or applying them to his contemporaries.

Certainly once Osee and Jeremiah uttered their oracles, anyone who takes up the image of the faithless wife is not thereby of necessity exegeting and actualizing Os and Jer. It is quite possible for someone to take the same idea (and ideas from elsewhere) and develop these notions on his own, exercising a certain freedom with the prior material. If someone were to do that, how would it differ from what we find in Ez 16? And if someone were actualizing Os and Jer, should he not be more faithful to the original details? Should there not be evidence of some control exercised on the new composition by the old? Should not the creativity of the new composition be in the development on and actualization of <u>given data</u> in the light of a new situation rather than in arbitrarily altering the given data? Even in such highly creative midrashic compositions such as Wis 11-19 and GA, the new material is presented by way of <u>addition</u> and <u>elaboration</u> upon the old. Original details may be omitted but they are not usually altered unless there is a doctrinal or exegetical motive operative.

Granted that we are not necessarily dealing at this early stage with fixed texts of Os and Jer and that the midrashic operation is for the most part not claimed to be on specific verses but on the oracles of Jeremiah and Osee as a whole, nevertheless it seems to this writer that even here there should be evidence of a good deal more fidelity to and concern over the original oracles on the part of Ezechiel before one is authorized to speak of more than mere literary dependence and go on

to see in Ez 16 midrashic preoccupations of the kind mentioned above.

Aside from the above considerations, we would also question Mlle. Bloch's approach to Ez 16 as a single unit. Most critics today hold that one or more redactors are responsible for considerable portions of Ez and that these additions constitute editorial comment and interpretation on the original work.

With regard to Ez 16, Eichrodt, Fohrer, and Zimmerli see vv. 1-43 as the original piece dating from before 587, and they see 44-58 and 59-63 as later additions. Even within the original piece subsequent additions are pointed out:

Zimmerli--parts of 13; 16-23; 26-29; 30-34; 36; 37a^{b}-38; 41b-43.

Eichrodt--17-21; 25b^{b}-29; 30-34; 41a^{a}; 41^{b}; 43b^{b}.

Fohrer --16-21; 26-29; 30-34.[1]

There is certainly an element of subjectivity in determining precisely what words constitute later interpretation, but 16(17)-21(23, 26-29, 30-34, 44-58, 59-63 do seem clearly to have all the appearances of being later additions.

44-58 starts the allegory all over again by taking up

---

[1]Walther Eichrodt, Der Prophet Hesekiel: Kapitel 1-18 ("Das Alte Testament Deutsch"; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959), pp. 115-34; Georg Fohrer, Ezechiel ("Handbuch zum Alten Testament"; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955), pp. 83-94; Walther Zimmerli, Ezechiel ("Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament"; Neukirchen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1955f.), I, 331-71.

v. 3 and developing the new idea of "sisters" for a new application. It does not threaten judgment as does 1-43 but clearly presupposes that judgment has taken place and this suggests a date after 587.[1] 59-63, set off by "thus says the Lord God" at beginning and end, takes up a new idea (the new covenant) and ties together the whole chapter by referring to vv. 8, 43, 44ff.[2]

In 24-25 we find something of a repetition of v. 16. There is a formal introduction to this repetition in v. 23 and yet for all this solemn introduction there is no clear distinction between the activity of 16 and 24-25. Now repetition is found in Ez (cf. vv. 6 and 8), but here it would seem due to a later addition, since v. 39 (part of the original piece) speaks of the removal of the gāb and rāmâ of v. 24 but says nothing of doing away with the bāmôt tᵉlu'ôt (v. 16) and salmê zākār (v. 17). Hence the conclusion that vv. 16-23 are the later addition.[3]

26-29 seems to be a later amplification to spell out Jerusalem's harlotry in terms of her political rather than religious activity.[4]

30-34 takes up the gāb and rāmâ of 24 but this time as places of political rather than religious harlotry, and it seems

---

[1]Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 120; Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 365.

[2]Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 369.

[3]Ibid., p. 354.

[4]Ibid., p. 358.

to be a separate addition subsequent to 26-29.[1]

We can see, then, from such a literary analysis of Ez 16 how further comments upon and applications of Ezechiel's oracle have been inserted with the text (by Ezechiel in 16-23 and 26-29 perhaps, in the other cases by later interpreters[2]).

16-23 elaborates on the picture of the faithless wife and spells out in detail the religious harlotry that was probably implied in the original piece.

26-29, no doubt in the light of specific circumstances, applies the harlot image to Jerusalem's political activity. What these specific circumstances may have been is a bit difficult to determine. If they refer to the events of 701 as Eichrodt suggests,[3] then, as Fohrer points out,[4] the mention of Assyria in v. 28 hobbles along behind; Babylon shouldn't be mentioned at all; and, moreover, one wonders why a later addition would go back so far into the history for allusions. Fohrer suggests that the verses refer to the events around 587 when there were again dealings with Egypt and when the attempts to put off the Babylonians and to insure fidelity with them surpassed earlier overtures to the Assyrians. When all this miscarried Juda went

---

[1] Ibid., p. 359.

[2] Fohrer, op. cit., pp. 90, 92; Zimmerli, op. cit., pp. 356, 363.

[3] Eichrodt, op. cit., pp. 124-25.

[4] Fohrer, op. cit., p. 90.

under and the Philistines enriched themselves on Juda's territory. Here too, the order is difficult. Perhaps the best solution is to date it close to 587 and to see the references as being to both the past and the contemporary situation (with Cooke).[1]

30-34 seems to refer to various tributes or taxes paid. 44-58 and 59-63 apply the original allegory to the exilic situation and add a message of hope.

Irwin[2] and Vogt[3] speak of such additions in Ezechiel as midrashic. The additions start with a given oracle and in a homiletic fashion actualize it for a later audience by making the original piece more vivid, more explicit and more relevant to contemporary needs. However, this feature of the chapter is not midrashic either nor does it make the chapter a midrash (see the section above on redaction).

Related Literary Forms

Before we close our discussion, it might be helpful to comment on three literary forms which border, so to speak, on the genre midrash: history, apocalyptic, and a type of literature that we shall tentatively call mashal. It would take us

---

[1]G. A. Cooke, The Book of Ezekiel ("The International Critical Commentary"; New York: Scribner's, 1937), pp. 170-71.

[2]William A. Irwin, The Problem of Ezechiel (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943).

[3]Ernst Vogt, "Texumdeutungen im Buch Ezechiel," Sacra Pagina (Paris: Gabalda, 1959), I, 475-78.

too far afield to discuss fully these related areas, but the following remarks might serve as helpful indications for future studies.

A. History: As we have seen in our discussion of Chr, Antiquities, the historical psalms, and the homily of Wis 11-19, midrash and the historical genre are not always easy to distinguish. History is concerned with the interpretation of events. Midrash is concerned with the interpretation of texts. Whenever the object of discussion is clearly one or the other, there is of course no difficulty in classification according to genre. Frequently, however, the texts which are the subject of a midrash are narratives dealing with events and thus there is an interest in the events related (GA, Wis 11-19). Likewise, the events which are the subject of a history are not infrequently known to the historian from earlier texts and are recounted by reproducing these earlier sources in part or in whole (Chr). In areas such as these it is sometimes very difficult in practice to classify a work according to genre. In theory, at least, the general rule of thumb can be given that a midrash will be distinguishable by its interest not in events simpliciter but in events as related in a specific way in a given text, and that a characteristic feature of a midrash will frequently be an attention to the details of a given narrative and the acceptance of the general framework of a narrative (as opposed to a recasting of it). A good example of this would be the midrash on Melchisedek in Heb (to discuss for a moment a text outside of our

literature). It is not the historical figure Melchisedek as such that is discussed. It is the Biblical account, or Melchisedek as set forth in Gn: his actions there, his lack of genealogy (on the principle that what is not in the Bible does not exist), the word Salem, etc. The midrashic nature of this passage is of course made especially clear by the argumentation based on the lack of genealogy. Such obvious "attention to a text" will not be had in every midrashic passage and it will sometimes be very difficult to determine if it is present, but it is this type of thing that the literary critic must look for when he seeks to distinguish midrashic passages from histories.

B. Apocalyptic.--In her article "Midrash" in the Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément Renée Bloch states that there is a very close relationship between apocalyptic and midrash.[1] In the ensuing discussion she first of all points out the similarities between the two: both literary forms instruct and edify; they hark back to Scripture or oral traditions to reinterpret the past for the sake of the present and the future; both manifest a deep sense of the supernatural and are characterized by hyperbolic style. The difference between the two is that midrash is a work of reflection on traditions and therefore is oriented toward the past, whereas apocalyptic is concerned with

---

[1]Bloch, "Midrash," cols. 1276-78. Robert states that the two forms are distinct but that sometimes the distinction is difficult to make in practice (Guide to the Bible, p. 509).

revelations and is oriented toward the eschatological future. This difference, though, is only apparent because in reality midrash is concerned with the past for the sake of present and future needs, and apocalyptic, in order to justify its eschatological predictions, scrutinizes the history of the past or recounts some alleged prophecy of the past. Bloch then concludes that apocalyptic is really only a variety of midrash. Needless to say this discussion of the two literary forms is not a very satisfying one to the present writer.

It is apparently more difficult to isolate the primary characteristics of apocalyptic than of midrash,[1] but for our purposes a general descriptive definition of apocalyptic should suffice. Apocalyptic is prophecy about the imminent eschatological future. In its pure form (i.e., without true prophetic vision behind it) it presents itself in the guise of revelations which were allegedly given to some personality of the past and which have been hidden for a long time and are now published. It is frequently characterized by lush imagery (because it is dealing with the distant future) and mysterious symbols (because it was often "resistance literature" and it had of necessity to be cryptic). It is a literature whose purpose is to stir up hope during days of crisis by demonstrating that things will get better soon (and hence there is a fondness for the calculation

---

[1]See Bruce Vawter, C.M., "Apocalyptic: Its Relation to Prophecy," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 22 (1960), 33-46, and the bibliography there.

of times, etc.). To establish confidence in this demonstration, something of the past is set forth and interpreted in order to give credence to what is said about the future. It is at this point that we come to the area where apocalyptic and midrash may be combined in a given work. If the apocalyptic work scrutinizes past history for a key to the future or employs folklore about a non-Biblical figure of the past so as to attribute prophecies to him, it is simple apocalyptic. But if the apocalyptic work scrutinizes Biblical texts from the past for the answers to the future and reinterprets these texts in the manner proper to apocalyptic, then the work is of a composite genre; it is both apocalyptic and midrash. As always, the factor that determines if midrash is present or not is whether or not the discussion is for the sake of some Biblical text; and the deficiencies of the discussion of Bloch on apocalyptic and midrash are that she has not kept this essential point in mind, and that she has introduced into the discussion other characteristics which are not constitutive of midrash and which, as a matter of fact, are secondary characteristics of many literary forms.

In conclusion, then, apocalyptic and midrash are distinct literary forms, but sometimes they exist together as a compound literary form when apocalyptic is scrutinizing a text of the past (or conversely, when midrash is interpreting a text in an apocalyptic manner).

To illustrate the above remarks from the Book of Daniel: Dn 1-6 contains stories about Daniel, a hero of the past. The

stories are recounted to attribute the subsequent visions of the book to Daniel and thus give them some authority. The stories also of themselves set forth Daniel as a model of perseverance in adversity and thus encourage the reader in time of persecution. There is nothing midrashic here--although sometimes these stories are called the midrashic section of the book (along with chs. 13-14) because they are didactic fiction;[1] but the remarks made above in the case of Esther and Tobit are valid here also: the genre is not midrash but haggadah, at the service of apocalyptic. Dn 7-8 are visions allegedly received by Daniel. These chapters are simple apocalyptic, scrutinizing the history of the past and imposing a pattern upon it which indicates that deliverance is at hand. Dn 9, however, is apocalyptic and midrash. Daniel seeks an understanding of the 70 years in the prophecy of Jer (25,11; 29,10), and the interpretation of Jer is presented in an apocalyptic manner--an alleged vision and revelation (Dn 9,20-27). This is the midrashic section in Dn, and not cc. 1-6; 13-14.

Another example of midrashic apocalyptic is 4 Esd 12,10ff. where the vision and its interpretation in Dn 7 is reinterpreted apocalyptically with alleged revelation. Possibly Ez 38-39 is a midrashic apocalypse, if it is an attempt to reinterpret eschatologically the "foe from the north" in Joel 2,20; Jer 1,14; 4,6; 6,1.

---

[1] E.g., Ellis, op. cit., pp. 451, 517-23.

A work which offers difficulties in the discussion of both apocalyptic and midrash is the Book of Jubilees. The question of the literary form of Jubilees is a complex one, for it seems to be a book of composite genre: history (in the ancient sense), apocalyptic (it makes Moses the recipient of all the disclosures in the book), testament (the several spiritual testaments of the Patriarchs) and perhaps midrash (the large amount of embellishments which may be for the sake of the Biblical text). One need only look at the various titles the book has been given to see the difficulty involved in ascertaining the literary form: Jubilees, The Little Genesis, Apocalypse of Moses, Testament of Moses, etc.

The introduction of the book states that "this is the history of the division of the days of the law and the testimony, of the events of the years, of their (year) weeks, of their Jubilees" from creation to Sinai (cf. also the conclusion), and certainly a prominent feature throughout the work is the chronological framework dominated by the number seven that is imposed upon the Biblical material. For the author, the history of the world is made up of three fixed periods (1,26-29): the <u>period of testimony</u> (the 49 Jubilees [49 x 49 yrs.] from creation to the Exodus, the passage to the next era being marked by tribulations of the people); the <u>period of the law</u> (starting at the beginning of the 50th Jubilee with the Exodus, the passage to the next era being marked by the tribulations of the people); and the <u>new or messianic era</u> which will be concluded by God's coming to dwell

among his faithful for all eternity.

The Book of Jubilees begins on Sinai with Moses being taught this "division of all the days" (1,4). The revelation that Moses allegedly received is recorded in the remainder of Jubilees (2-50). The historical account with chronological pattern superimposed runs from creation to the moment of the Exodus from Egypt at which point Jubilees ends. The subsequent events in Israel's history are not recounted, but there is a prophetic picture of the religious conduct of the people during the period from Sinai to the second temple given to Moses on Sinai (1,5-25) and also an apocalyptic section on the Messianic woes which will introduce the new era (23,9-32), woes described in terms of the oppression of the Seleucids of the author's time.

To the present writer the Book of Jubilees appears to be first and foremost an apocalypse. It purports to be a revelation given to Moses and handed down secretly about the fixed pattern of history and its periods. The first period is set forth with a fixed numerical pattern. The second period, in which the author lived, is not recounted or provided with a numerical pattern, but it is described in a summary manner, and it is hinted, undoubtedly to offer encouragement and hope, that the present sufferings are to be interpreted as the tribulations that mark the end of the second period and usher in the third.[1]

---

[1]Underlying the whole work may have been further calculations of time and the belief that the second period would last

The primary purpose of retelling the Biblical story up to the Exodus seems not to have been that of GA, namely, to give a vivid and trouble-free version of Gn, but rather to impose the schematized chronology on Gn, to indicate that the author possessed a knowledge of the rhythm and order of past history, and thereby to reinforce the apocalyptic section (23,9-32) and inspire confidence in its suggestions that it was the Messianic woes which had arrived.

So much for the apocalyptic nature. Is the work also midrashic since in the course of retelling the Biblical narrative much legendary material has been incorporated? Does the legendary material serve the same function as it does in GA or is it non-midrashic as in Chr and Josephus' Antiquities? Has the author intended to write a new account of Israel's early history, or is he giving a better version of the old account, better because of the overlaid chronology and better because of the midrashic additions made here and there? It is a difficult question to answer. On the one hand the work is presented as material given to Moses in addition to what is contained in the Bible; it is presented as a separate and independent work containing the secret pattern of history and could thus be understood as an interpretation of history. On the other hand the work is obviously based on the Biblical text and in the re-telling,

---

22 Jubilees, but this is not explicit in the book. Cf. Michel Testuz, Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés (Geneve: Droz, 1960), pp. 173, 175.

difficulties in the Biblical narrative are solved, gaps supplied, offensive elements removed and the spirit of later Judaism infused into the primitive history. This would suggest that the author had a midrashic aim as well as an apocalyptic one. There is no compelling reason that would prevent us from looking upon the embellishments as midrashic and we would be inclined to see Jubilees as another example of an apocalyptic-midrashic work.

C. "Mashal."--We have seen above two uses of anthological style: a midrashic one in which texts are explained or applied to a situation and a non-midrashic one in which a new composition is expressed in the diction of the past. There is a third use of anthological style in which an event is narrated or a thing is described in such a way that a comparison or equation is made between something new and something old. It is what Laurentin has pointed out in Lk 1-2 and has called "allusive theology."[1] An example of one type of it in our literature would be the first nine chapters of Prv. Robert's discussion of these chapters is well-known and it is not necessary, even if space allowed, to reproduce his analysis here.[2] While one may not agree with Robert in every detail, it is manifest that

---

[1]René Laurentin, Structure et theologie de Luc I-II (Paris: Gabalda, 1957).

[2]A. Robert, p.s.s., "Les attaches littéraires bibliques de Prov I-IX," Revue Biblique, 43 (1934), 42-68; 172-204; 374-84; 44 (1935), 344-65; 502-25. For a briefer presentation cf. idem, "Littéraires (genres)," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, 5 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1957), cols. 414-16; Roland E. Murphy, O.Carm., Seven Books of Wisdom (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1960), pp. 11-13.

the author of Prv 1-9 has reused words and phrases of earlier Biblical books (Dt, Jer, and Deutero-Isaiah especially) in order to present wisdom in the garb of a prophet, in order to identify wisdom in some way with God, and also, although not in the explicit manner of Ben Sira and Baruch, to identify wisdom with the Torah, and to make the hakamim heirs of the prophets. By such a presentation the author of Prv 1-9 apparently wished to further incorporate into Judaism a wisdom tradition which was of foreign and secular origins, and to present wisdom as a legitimate vehicle for describing the good life under the Law.

The method which the author of Prv 1-9 used to accomplish this was the method of allusions. He does not cite earlier texts properly speaking or juxtapose texts, but he employs images and phrases associated with the Torah and the prophets and uses them in connection with wisdom to show that the wisdom tradition is the modern counterpart of ancient realities. Thus, as Robert puts it, "les matériaux déjà élaborés qu'il emprunte aux anciens édifices et que jusqu'à certain point il replace sur leurs anciennes fondations sont destinés à prendre un aspect tout nouveau, parce qu'ils vont être employés dans un bâtiment de style essentiellement moderne."[1]

Allusive theology of this sort is not midrashic as Bloch

---

[1]Robert, "Les attaches littéraires...," Revue Biblique, 44 (1935), 347.

has suggested.[1] The author of Prv 1-9--as Robert himself points out--does not allude to texts in order to gloss them or to try to prolong them "dans leur ligne," but in order to transpose them on a new level.[2] Specific texts of earlier Scripture are not cited as a point of departure for a discussion that attempts to make these texts relevant for a new generation. Rather, images and vocabulary strongly associated with the Law and the prophets are now associated with wisdom, and the implication is thus made that there is a continuity between them, and that wisdom is the successor of the prophet and the equivalent of the Law. There is no attempt to make earlier texts refer to wisdom. Rather the earlier texts bestow the Deuteronomic and prophetic mantle upon wisdom personified. And this is not midrash.

Another variety of this use of anthological style is found in 1QS 8,4-10. Unlike Prv 1-9 where it is a question merely of the employment of vocabulary that is associated with institutions of the past, here specific texts are alluded to:

> (4) . . . When these things come to pass in Israel,
> (5) the Council of the Community shall be established in truth as an everlasting planting (Is 60,21)
> It is the House of holiness for Israel
> and the Company of infinite (6) holiness for Aaron;
> they are the witnesses of truth unto judgment

---

[1] Bloch, "Midrash," col. 1273.

[2] Robert, "Les attaches littéraires ... ," Revue Biblique, 44 (1935), 347.

and the chosen of loving-kindness	(Is 42,1 perhaps)
appointed to offer expiation for the earth	
and to bring down (7) punishment upon the wicked.	(Ps 94,2 perhaps)
It is the tried wall, the precious cornerstone;	
(8) its foundations shall not tremble	
nor flee from their place.	(Is 28,16)
It is the Dwelling of infinite holiness (9) for Aaron	
in <eternal> knowledge unto the Covenant of justice	
and to make offerings of sweet savor;	frequent OT sacrificial terminology
(it is) the House of perfection and truth in Israel	
(10) to establish the Covenant according to the everlasting precepts.	
And they shall be accepted as expiation for the earth	
and to decree the judgment of wickedness	
with no perversity remaining.	

In lines 7 and 8 there is clearly an allusion to Is 28,16: the community is the cornerstone of which Isaiah spoke. In line 5 we have an allusion to the "planting" of Is 60,21. Of itself the occurrence of mṭ't here does not necessarily suggest the Isaian passage, but the term is used elsewhere to designate the sect (1QS 11,8; CD 1,7) and thus was apparently a popular term, and in 1QH 6,15 and 1QH 8 the connection is clearly made with Is 60,21. In line 6 the bḥyry rṣwn may have been inspired by Is 42,1: bḥyry rṣth npšy. If so, it too would be an allusion by which the community is identified with the Servant of Yahweh who is "appointed to offer expiation for the earth."[1] The rest of

---

[1]Thus P. Wernberg-Møller, "Some Reflections on the Biblical Material in the Manual of Discipline," Studia Theologica, 9 (1955), 64.

the citations seem merely to contribute terminology to the passage. This passage could be considered a midrash (a pointing out of the fulfillment of the respective prophecies), but the anthological technique does seem to be of the sort found in Prv 1-9, and perhaps the passage is better conceived of not as a literature about a literature (midrash) but as literature about the sect, in which Scripture is used in an allusive manner to interpret the significance of the community.[1]

As described above, neither of these examples is midrash for neither is a literature about a literature. In both examples there is indeed interest in prior Biblical material but attention is also given to a new thing or event and the latter is the primary point of interest and not the Scripture. Is this third type of anthological style constitutive of a literary genre all of its own? It is difficult to say. Perhaps it is. Laurentin, in addition to his (erroneous) suggestion of midrash as the genre of Lk 1-2, also suggests that mashal would be an apt category for this type of material, because of the element of comparison between past Scripture and new event.[2] The literary genre mashal is not without its own obscurities too,[3] and the present writer would not care to take a stand on

---

[1]In the NT Lk 1-2 would be another example of the same type of material, literature interpreting the Christ-event and using Scripture to express the interpretation.

[2]Laurentin, op. cit., pp. 117-18.

[3]There is no agreement on the meaning of the word in the OT. Cf. A. R. Johnson, "Māšāl," Wisdom in Israel and in the

the matter at the moment, but only to call attention to a suggestion that has not received attention and which may be a much more fruitful area of investigation into the genre of the above material than midrash.

If material like Prv 1-9 and 1QS 8,4-10 is a distinct literary genre because of this allusive type of anthological style, it would stand midway between the midrashic use of anthological style (CD 20,17-22) and that "pure" anthology (1QM 12) which of itself is not constitutive of a literary form but can be put at the service of any literary genre.

Distinctive anthological literary genre or not, the type of material represented by Prv 1-9 is not midrash but is of some other genre. At times borderline examples will be found (like 1QS 8,4-10) and, as with some historical works so also here, it will be difficult to determine if these passages are midrashic or not, if they are literature for the sake of a prior literature or for the sake of a new thing or event.

One such borderline case we might discuss here as a concluding example, the Book of Judith--up to now perhaps conspicuous by its absence from all of the discussions. As Patrick Skehan has pointed out, the Book of Judith is based in an extraordinary way on Exodus, perhaps on Ex 14,31 if one were to single out a particular verse. The Canticle of Judith echoes the Canticle

---

Ancient Near East (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, III; Leiden: Brill, 1955), pp. 162-69 and the bibliography on p. 162, n. 1.

of Miriam and the narrative portion of Judith reflects primarily the Exodus events, so that both in the prose and the poetry what is done by Judith's hand is set forth as a revival of what was done by the hand of God and the hand of Moses at the Exodus.[1]

These findings raise anew the question of the literary form of Judith. Is the book a midrash on Ex 14,31 (the hand of God in Ex is ever active)? Or is it an example of allegorical haggadah, a meditation on God's providence and another example of the mashal category of anthological style (the ideal event described in Judith being equated or likened to the Exodus event)? It is very difficult to decide. If Judith were found in a Jewish midrashic work after Ex 14,31, it would clearly be a midrash and a very beautiful one. But are the allusions to Ex strong enough to create that context on their own? The allusions when perceived are striking. The curious emphasis on the "hand" and the possible Passover (yodh daleth = hand = 14 [Nisan]) connection do suggest that this is a homily in narrative form on the Ex text. But is this the main theme? The allusions to Ex are not immediately recognizable nor are they the only allusions to Israel's history and the repeated idea that as long as Israel does not sin against their God they will prosper (4,12-21; 8,18-20; 11,10; 16,15) suggests that perhaps this was the main theme in the mind of the author. Judith is truly a borderline case

---

[1]Patrick Wm. Skehan, "The Hand of Judith," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 25 (1963), 94-110.

and ultimately the critic's decision on literary form will depend on which features of the book strike him as the primary ones.

SUMMARY

The word midrâsh is used in modern Biblical studies as a technical literary term to designate a literary genre. The word has been borrowed from the rabbis for whom the word designated the activity of Biblical interpretation, a method of exegesis, and a body of exegetical literature. In adopting the rabbinic term for the modern literary classification, the literary critic implicitly limits the meaning of the term to the third acceptation it had for the rabbis and he implicitly sets up as the exemplar of the modern literary category that body of literature the rabbis called midrash, and then seeks to build up his classification by including under it other works which manifest the same primary characteristics.

In terms of primary characteristics we would define midrash as a composition which seeks to make a text of Scripture from the past understandable, useful, and relevant for the religious needs of a later generation. It is thus a literature about a literature. It is frequently characterized by a careful analysis of the sacred text and by a creative approach to the sacred page, but any single midrashic unit may be an exception to this rule.

Some examples of midrashic works in the literature in-

vestigated would be the pesharim from Qumrân, the midrash of the Passover Haggadah, the Palestinian Targums, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and the homily in Wis 11-19.

In addition isolated midrashic sections occur in works of other genres in connection with explicit and implicit Biblical citations. However, an implicit or explicit citation from Scripture does not necessarily indicate that the surrounding passage is midrashic. The text may be merely contributing to the new composition. Only if the new composition contributes something by way of understanding to the text cited is the composition midrash. In the same connection, the mere citation of a text of Scripture in a specific sense is not a midrash. An interpretation of the original text has taken place in the mind of the author, but the composition that he writes does not interpret it and therefore the composition is not midrashic.

Just as context is a determining factor of literary form in the case of parable and allegory, so also with midrash. A midrash is always explicitly or implicitly placed in the context of the Biblical text(s) upon which it comments. Works like Chr and Antiquities which rework Biblical material in what appears to be the same manner as the Genesis Apocryphon are not midrash because these works are not to be read in the context of the Bible. They are not literature about a literature. They are works of history that stand independent of earlier ones. Likewise, works of didactic fiction which are not placed by the

author in the context of a Biblical text are not midrash. If we are to be precise in our classification of literary genres, we should borrow from the rabbis the term haggadah as well as the term midrash and use the term haggadah to describe works of didactic fiction.

Redaction must not be confused with midrash. Redaction is a process or a stage in the production of a work of any genre; midrash is a composition with specific characteristics. Frequently redaction and the writing of a midrash are undertaken for identical motives but the work resulting from redaction is not thereby a midrash. Glosses strictly speaking should not be classified as midrash either. They are really successive additions to a book which intentionally or accidentally have become part of the sacred text and are absorbed by the literary form of that text.

Anthological style does not necessarily make a composition midrash. It can be employed to create a composition that focuses attention on earlier texts and elucidates them (midrash); it can also be used in a non-midrashic manner to contribute vocabulary and the Biblical atmosphere to a new work of any genre.

Genres bordering on midrash are history, apocalyptic and what we have tentatively termed mashal. The differences are stated and criteria for attempting a classification of borderline material are given.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

ar-Râzî, Fahr ad-Dîn. at-Tafsîr al-kabîr. Edited by Muhammad Muhyîddîn 'Abd al-Ḥamîd. Cairo: Miṣrîya, 1352-57/1933-38.

Auzou, Georges. The Word of God. St. Louis: Herder, 1960.

Avigad, N., and Yadin, Y. A Genesis Apocryphon. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea. Jerusalem: Magnes Press of the Hebrew University, 1956.

Bacher, Wilhelm. Die Agada der babylonischen Amoräer. Strassburg: Karl Trübner, 1878.

_____. Die Agada der palästinensischen Amoräer. 3 vols. Strassburg: Karl Trübner, 1892-99.

_____. Die Agada der Tannaiten. 2 vols. Strassburg: Karl Trübner, 1884-90.

_____. Die älteste Terminologie der jüdischen Schriftauslegung. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1899.

_____. Die Bibel- und traditionsexegetische Terminologie der Amoräer. Leipzig: J. D. Hinrichs, 1905.

_____. Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur. 2 vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1899-1905.

_____. Die Proömien der alten Jüdischen Homilie. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913.

Barthélemy, D., and Milik, J. T. Qumran Cave I. "Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 1." Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Barton, George A. The Book of Ecclesiastes. "International Critical Commentary." New York: Scribner's, 1908.

Bentzen, Aage. Introduction to the Old Testament. 2 vols. 2d ed. Copenhagen: Gad, 1952.

Betz, Otto. Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1960.

Bonsirven, Joseph, S.J. Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ. 2 vols. Paris: Beauchesne, 1935.

_____. Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse paulinienne. Paris: Beauchesne, 1938.

Braude, William G. The Midrash on Psalms. "Yale Judaica Series." Vol. XIII. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

Bright, John. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

Brockelmann, Carl. Lexicon Syriacum. 2d ed. revised. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1923.

Brooke, A. E., McLean, N., and Thackeray, H. St. J. The Old Testament in Greek. 3 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1906-1940.

Brown, F., Driver, S. R., and Briggs, C. A. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Corrected impression. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.

Brownlee, W. H. The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline. "BASOR Supplementary Studies, Nos. 10-12." New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951.

Burrows, Millar. The Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: Viking, 1955.

_____. (ed.) The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. Vol. 2, Fasc. 2: Plates and Transcriptions of the Manual of Discipline. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951.

_____. More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: Viking, 1958.

_____. The Literary Relations of Ezekiel. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society Press, 1925.

Carmignac, Jean. La règle de la guerre. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958.

The Complete Bible: An American Translation. Revised edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Connelly, Marc. Green Pastures. New York: Farrar and Reinhart, 1929.

Cooke, G. A. The Book of Ezekiel. "The International Critical Commentary." New York: Scribner's, 1937.

Cross, Jr., Frank Moore. The Ancient Library of Qumrân and Modern Biblical Studies. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1958.

Curtis, E. L., and Madsen, A. A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles. "International Critical Commentary." New York: Scribner's, 1910.

Daube, David. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London: Athalone Press, 1956.

Deane, W. J. The Book of Wisdom. Oxford: Clarendon, 1881.

Deimel, Anton. Šumerisches Lexicon. 4 Teile. Rom: Papstliches Bibelinstitut, 1928-37.

Delcor, M. Essai sur le midrash d'Habacuc. Paris: Cerf, 1951.

Delitzsch, Franz. Commentary on the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes. Translated by M. G. Easton. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1891.

de Landberg, Le Comte. Glossaire Datinois. Vol. I. Leide: E. J. Brill, 1920.

Dillmann, C. F. A. Lexicon linguae Aethiopicae cum indice Latina. Lipsiae: T. O. Weigel, 1865.

Doeve, J. W. Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954.

Driver, S. R. An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. 10th ed. New York: Scribner's, 1903.

Dubarle, A.-M. Les sages d'Israël. Paris: Cerf, 1946.

Dupont-Sommer, A. Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1953.

_____. The Essene Writings from Qumran. Translated by G. Vermes. Cleveland: Meridian, 1962.

Eichrodt, Walther. Der Prophet Hesekiel: Kapitel 1-18. "Das Alte Testament Deutsch." Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959.

Eissfeldt, Otto. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1934.

Elliger, Karl. Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953.

Ellis, E. Earle. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.

Ellis, Peter. The Men and the Message of the Old Testament. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1963.

Enelow, H. G. (ed.) The Mishnah of Rabbi Eliezer. New York: Bloch, 1933.

Feldmann, F. Das Buch der Weisheit. BonnerBibel; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1926.

Fichtner, J. Weisheit Salomos. HAT; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1938.

Fohrer, Georg. Ezechiel. "Handbuch zum Alten Testament." Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955.

Frankel, Israel. Peshat in Talmudic and Midrashic Literature. Toronto: La Salle Press, 1956.

Galling, Kurt. Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra, Nehemia. "Das Alte Testament Deutsch." Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954.

Gaster, Theodor H. The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1956.

Geiger, A. Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwicklung des Judenthums. Breslau: Hainauer, 1857.

Gelb, Ignace J., et al (eds.). The Assyrian Dictionary. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1956- .

Gesenius, Wilhelm. Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament. 17th ed. by F. Buhl. Leipzig: Vogel, 1921.

_____. Thesaurus philologicus criticus linguae Hebraeae et Chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti. 3 vols. Lipsiae: Fr. Chr. Guil. Vogelius, 1829-53.

_____, and Kautzsch, E. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Rev. A. E. Cowley. 2d Eng. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.

Ginzberg, Louis. Legends of the Jews. 7 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1909-38.

Goettsberger, Johann. Die Bücher der Chronik oder Paralipomenon. "Bonnerbibel." Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1939.

Goodrick, A. T. S. The Book of Wisdom. New York: Macmillan, 1913.

Gordis, Robert. Koheleth: The Man and His World. New York: Bloch, 1955.

Gordon, Cyrus H. Ugaritic Manual. "Analecta Orientalia, No. 35." Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1955.

Grant, Frederick C. Ancient Judaism and the New Testament. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1960.

Grébaut, Sylvain. Supplément au Lexicon linguae Aethiopicae de August Dillmann (1865) et Édition du lexique de Juste d'Urbin (1850-55). Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1952.

Gregg, J. A. F. The Wisdom of Solomon. Cambridge: The University Press, 1909.

Grimm, C. L. W. Das Buch der Weisheit. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1860.

Habermann, A. M. Megilloth Midbar Yehuda. Jerusalem: Mahbarot Lesifrut, 1959.

Hamburger Realencyclopädie des Judentums. Vol. II. Neustrelitz: 1896.

Hamp, Vinzenz. Sirach. "Echterbibel." Würzburg: Echter, 1951.

Hatch, Edwin, and Redpath, Henry A. A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament Including the Apocryphal Books. 2 vols. with Supplement. New printing; Graz: Akademischen Druck- und Verlangsanstalt, 1954.

Hartman, L. Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Heidenheim, M. Der Commentar Marqoh's des Samaritaners. Weimar: Felber, 1896.

Heinemann, Isaac. Altjüdische Allegoristik. Breslau: Marcus, 1936.

_____. Darkê ha-Aggadah [The Methods of the Aggadah]. 2d ed. Jerusalem. The Hebrew University Press, 1954.

Heinisch, P. Das Buch der Weisheit. EHAT; Münster: Aschendorff, 1912.

Holmes, Robert, and Parsons, Jacob. Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus. 5 vols. Oxford: Cooke, Fletcher and Hanwell, 1798-1827.

The Holy Bible: Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. Paterson: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1953- .

The Holy Bible: Revised Standard Version and the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1946-57.

Irwin, William A. The Problem of Ezechiel. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

James, M. R. The Biblical Antiquities of Philo, Now First Translated from the Old Latin Version. New York: Macmillan, 1917.

Jastrow, Marcus. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature. New York: Verlag Choreb, 1926.

Jean, C. F., and Hoftijzer, J. Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'Ouest. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960- .

Jeffery, Arthur. The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'ān. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1938.

Jellinek, A. Bet ha-Midrasch. 2d ed. Jerusalem: Bamberger and Wahrmann, 1938.

Kadushin, Max. The Rabbinic Mind. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1952.

Kahle, Paul (ed.). Masoreten des Westens. Vol. II. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930.

_____. The Cairo Geniza. London: Oxford University Press, 1947; 2d ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1959.

Kalt, E. Das Buch der Weisheit. HBK; Freiburg: Herder, 1938.

Koehler, L., and Baumgartner, W. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros. 2 vols. 2d ed. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.

Kisch, Guido. Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1949.

Kittel, R. (ed.) Biblia Hebraica. 9th ed. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1954.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. Psalmen. "Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament, XV." Neukirchen Kr. Moers: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1960.

Kuhn, K. G. Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1960.

Landberg, Le Comte de. Glossaire Datînois. 3 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1920-42.

Lane, Edward William. An Arabic-English Lexicon. 8 vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1863-93.

Laurentin, Rene. Structure et theologie de Luc I-II. "Études Bibliques." Paris: Gabalda, 1957.

Lauterbach, Jacob Z. Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael. 3 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933-35.

Le Deaut, R., C.S.Sp. La nuit pascale. Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1963.

Leslau, Wolf. Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon. "University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, Vol. 20." Berkeley: University of California Press, 1958.

Lieberman, Saul. Hellenism in Jewish Palestine. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1950.

Levi, Israel. L'Ecclésiastique ou la sagesse de Jésus, fils de Sira. 2 vols. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1898-1901.

Levie, Jean, S.J. La Bible, parole humaine et message de Dieu. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1958.

Levy, Jacob. Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim. Nebst Beiträgen von Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer. 4 vols. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1876-89.

Lods, Adolphe. Histoire de la littérature hebraïque et juive. Paris: Payot, 1950.

McNeile, A. H. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. London: Macmillan, 1952.

Mandelkern, S. Veteris Testamenti concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae. Lipsiae: Veit, 1896.

Michel, A. Le Maître de Justice. Avignon: Aubanel, 1954.

Milik, J. T. Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea. "Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 26." London: SCM Press, 1959.

Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-30.

Moulton, R. The Literary Study of the Bible. London: Isbister, 1896.

Murphy, R. E., O.Carm. Seven Books of Wisdom. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1960.

Nöldeke, Theodor. Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft. Strassburg: Karl Trübner, 1910.

North, Robert. Israel's Chronicle. 1st preliminary ed. St. Mary's, Kansas, 1963. (Mimeographed)

Oesterley, W. O. E. The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach or Ecclesiasticus. "Cambridge Bible." Cambridge: The University Press, 1912.

_____. The Wisdom of Solomon. London: SPCK, 1918.

Osty, E., p.s.s. Le Livre de la Sagesse. "Bible de Jérusalem." 2d ed. rev. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1957.

Pagano, Sebastiano, O.M.I. Chronological Table of the Books of the Old Testament. Ottawa: University Seminary, 1959.

Peters, Norbert. Das Buch Jesus Sirach oder Ecclesiasticus. "Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Textament." Münster: Aschendorff, 1913.

_____. Der hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus. Freiburg im B.: Herder, 1902.

Pfeiffer, R. H. History of New Testament Times. New York: Harper, 1949.

_____. Introduction to the Old Testament. 2d ed. New York: Harper, 1948.

Pius XII. Divino Afflante Spiritu. Enchiridion Biblicum. Editio secunda aucta et recognita; Romae: Arnodo, 1954.

Podechard, E. L'Ecclésiaste. "Études Bibliques." Paris: Gabalda, 1912.

_____. Le Psautier. 3 vols. Lyon: Facultés Catholiques, 1949-54.

Rabin, Chaim. The Zadokite Documents. 2d rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Rappaport, Salomo. Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus. Wien: Kohut, 1930.

Reider, Joseph. The Book of Wisdom. New York: Harper, 1957.

Riessler, P. Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel. Augsburg: Filser, 1928.

Robert, A., and Feuillet, A. Introduction à la Bible. 2 vols. Tournai: Desclée, 1957-59.

Rosenblatt, Samuel. The Interpretation of the Bible in the Mishnah. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1935.

Rudolph, Wilhelm. Chronikbücher. "Handbuch zum Alten Testament." Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955.

La Sainte Bible traduite en français sous la direction de l'École Biblique de Jérusalem. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1956.

Schechter, S. Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. New York: 1910.

_____. Studies in Judaism. 3d Series. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1924.

_____, and Taylor, C. The Wisdom of Ben Sira. Cambridge: The University Press, 1899.

Seeligmann, I. L. The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. Leiden: Brill, 1948.

Segal, M. S. Sēper Ben Sira hašālēm. Jerusalem: M. Bialik, 1953.

Siegfried, Carl, and Stade, Bernhard. Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testamente. Leipzig: Veit, 1893.

Smend, Rudolph. Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach. 3 vols. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1906.

Stanley, David, S.J. The Gospel of St. Matthew. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1960.

Stendahl, Krister. The School of St. Matthew. Uppsala: Gleerup, 1954.

Strack, Hermann. Die Sprüche Jesus', des Sohnes Sirachs. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1903.

_____. Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. Reprint of English translation of 1931. New York: Meridian, 1959.

Sukenik, E. L. The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1955.

Testuz, Michel. Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés. Geneve: Droz, 1960.

Thackeray, H. St. J. Josephus. Vol. IV. London: Heinemann, 1930.

van der Woude, A. S. Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân. Assen: van Gorcum, 1957.

Vannutelli, P. Libri Synoptici Veteris Testamenti. Romae: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1931.

Vermès, Géza. Discovery in the Judean Desert. New York: Desclée, 1956.

_____. Scripture and Tradition in Judaism. Leiden: Brill, 1961.

von Soden, Wolfram. Akkadisches Handwörterbuch. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1959- .

Walton, Brian. Biblia Sacra polyglotta. 6 vols. London: Thos. Roycroft, 1657.

Waxman, Meyer. A History of Jewish Literature. Vol. I. Reprint of 2d ed. of 1938. New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1960.

Weis, P. R. Midrashic Selections. "Semetic Study Series." New Series. No. II. Leiden: Brill, 1955.

Wernberg-Møller, P. The Manual of Discipline. "Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah." Edited by J. van der Ploeg. Vol. I. Leiden: Brill, 1957.

Winckler, H. Altorientalische Forschungen. 2d series. t. 2. Fasc. 2 (1899).

Wünsche, A. Aus Israels Lehrhallen. Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1907-1910.

Zimmerli, Walther. Ezechiel. "Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament." Neukirchen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1955f.

Zunz, L. Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden. 2d ed. by N. Brüll. Frankfurt: J. Kauffmann, 1892.

Articles

Allegro, J. M. "A Newly Discovered Fragment of a Commentary on Ps xxxvii from Qumrân," Palestine Exploration Quarterly, 68 (1954), 69-75.

_____. "Further Light on the History of the Qumrân Sect," Journal of Biblical Literature, 75 (1956), 89-95.

_____. "Further Messianic References in Qumrân Literature," Journal of Biblical Literature, 75 (1956), 174-87.

_____. "More Isaiah Commentaries from Qumrân's Fourth Cave," Journal of Biblical Literature, 77 (1958), 215-21.

_____. "Fragments of a Qumrân Scroll of Eschatological Midrāšîm," Journal of Biblical Literature, 77 (1958), 350-54.

_____. "More Unpublished Pieces of a Qumran Commentary on Nahum (4Qp Nah)," Journal of Semitic Studies, 7 (1962), 304-308.

Alonso-Schökel, L. "Genera litteraria," Verbum Domini, 38 (1960), 1-15.

Bacher, Wilhelm. "The Origin of the word Haggada (Agada)," Jewish Quarterly Review, 4 (1892), 406-29.

_____. "Les trois branches de la science de la vieille tradition juive," Revue des Études Juives, 38 (1899), 211-19.

_____. "Bible Exegesis--Jewish," The Jewish Encyclopedia, 3 (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1902), 162-65.

Baillet, M. "Fragments du document de Damas: Qumrân, Grotte VI," Revue Biblique, 63 (1956), 513-23.

Bamberger, Bernard J. "The Dating of Haggadic Materials," Journal of Biblical Literature, 68 (1949), 115-23.

Bloch, Philipp. "Studien zur Aggadah," Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, 34 (1885), 174-84, 210-24, 257-64.

Bloch, Renée. "Écriture et tradition dans le judaïsme, aperçus sur l'origine du midrash," Cahiers Sioniens, 8 (1954), 9-34.

_____. "Quelques aspects de la figure de Moïse dans la tradition rabbinique," Cahiers Sioniens, 8 (1954), 211-85.

_____. "Note sur l'utilisation des fragments de la Geniza du Caire pour l'étude du Targum palestinien," Revue des Études Juives, New Series, 14 (1955), 5-35.

_____. "Note méthodologique pour l'étude de la littérature rabbinique," Recherches de science religieuse, 43 (1955), 194-227.

_____. "Ézéchiel XVI: example parfait du procécé midrashique dans la Bible," Cahiers Sioniens, 9 (1955), 193-223.

_____. "Juda engéndera Pharès et Zarah de Thamar (Mt 1,3)," Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de Andre Robert (Paris: Bloud et Gay), pp. 381-89.

_____. "Midrash," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, 5 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1957), cols. 1263-81.

Bonsirven, J., S.J. "Genres litteraires dans la littérature juive postbiblique," Biblica, 35 (1954), 328-45.

_____. "Interpretatio Aggadica," Verbum Domini, 30 (1952), 349-52.

Borgen, Peder. "Observations on the Midrashic Character of John 6," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 54 (1963), 232-40.

Bourke, Myles. "The Literary Genus of Matthew 1-2," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 22 (1960), 160-75.

Brockington, L. H. "Jonah," Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by M. Black and H. H. Rowley (London: Nelson, 1962).

Brown, Raymond E., S.S. "The Messianism of Qumrân," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 19 (1957), 53-82.

_____. "The Pre-Christian Semitic Concept of 'Mystery'," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 20 (1958), 417-43.

Brownlee, William H. "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," The Biblical Archaeologist, 14 (1951), 54-76.

_____. "The Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan," Duke University, February 2, 1953. (Mimeographed.)

_____. "The Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan," Journal of Jewish Studies, 7 (1956),

Bruce, F. F. "The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 43 (1961), 336-53.

Brunet, Adrien-M., O.P. "Le Chroniste et ses sources," Revue Biblique, 60 (1953), 481-508; 61 (1954), 349-86.

_____. "Paralipomènes," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, 6 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1960), cols. 1220-61.

Bruns, J. Edgar. "The Magi Episode in Matthew 2," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 23 (1961), 51-54.

Budde, Karl. "Vermutungen zum 'Midrasch des Buches der Könige,'" Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 12 (1892), 37-51.

Camps, Guiu M., O.S.B. "Midraš sobre la Història de les Plagues," Miscellanea Biblica B. Ubach (Montserrat, 1953), pp. 97-113.

Carmignac, Jean. "Les Citations de l'ancien testament dans 'La Guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres,'" Revue Biblique, 63 (1956), 254-60.

Chaine, J. "Les livres sapientiaux," Initiation Biblique. Edited by A. Robert and A. Tricot (Paris: Desclée, 1948).

Cohn, L. "An Apocryphal Work Ascribed to Philo of Alexandria," Jewish Quarterly Review, Old Series, 10 (1898), 277-332.

Cook, Stanley Arthur. "Midrash," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 18 (11th ed.; New York: Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc., 1911), 419-23.

Coppens, J. "L'Évangile lucanien de l'enfance," Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses, 33 (1957),

Daube, D. "The Earliest Structure of the Gospels," New Testament Studies, 5 (1959),

Delcor, M. "Contribution à l'étude de la législation des sectaires de Damas et de Qumrân," Revue Biblique, 61 (1954), 533-53; 62 (1955), 60-75.

de Vaux, R. "Exploration de la région de Qumrân," Revue Biblique, 60 (1953), 540-61.

Daumas, Francois. "Littérature prophétique et exégétique egyptienne et commentaires esséniens," A la rencontre de Dieu: Mémorial Albert Gelin (Le Puy: Xavier Mappus, 1961), pp. 203-21.

Díez-Macho, A. "Nuevos fragmentos del Targum palestinense," Sefarad, 15 (1955), 31-39.

_____. "Nuevos fragmentos de Tosefta Targumica," Sefarad, 16 (1956), 319-24.

_____. "Una copia de todo el Targum jerosolimitano en la Vaticana," Estudios Bíblicos, 15 (1956), 446-47.

_____. "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum," Congress Volume, Oxford ("Supplements to Vetus Testamentum"; vol. 7; Leiden: Brill, 1960), pp. 222-45.

Doeve, J. W. "Le rôle de la tradition orale dans la composition des évangiles synoptiques," La Formation des évangiles. Edited by J. Cambier and L. Cerfaux (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1957), pp. 70-84.

Dupont-Sommer, A. "Le Livre des Hymnes découvert près de la mer Morte," Semitica, 7 (1957).

Elmslie, W. A. L. "The First and Second Books of Chronicles," The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. 3. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954. Pp. 339-548.

Epstein, I. "Foreword," Midrash Rabbah. Vol. I. Edited by H. Freedman and Maurice Simon. London: Soncino Press, 1939.

Feuillet, A., p.s.s. "Jonas," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, 4 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1949), cols.

_____. "Les sources du livre de Jonas," Revue Biblique, 54 (1947), 161-86.

Finkelstein, Louis. "The Oldest Midrash: Pre-Rabbinic Ideals and Teachings in the Passover Haggadah," Harvard Theological Review, 31 (1938), 291-317.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., S.J. "'Now This Melchizedek . . .' (Heb 7,1)," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 25 (1963),

_____. "'4Q Testimonia' and the New Testament," Theological Studies, 18 (1957), 513-37.

_____. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," New Testament Studies, 7 (1960-61),

Freedman, David Noel. "The Chronicler's Purpose," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 23 (1961), 436-42.

Galbiati, E. "Esegesi degli Evangeli festivi. L'Adorazione dei Magi (Matt. 2,1-12)," Bibbia e Oriente, 4 (1962),

Gertner, M. "Midrashim in the New Testament," Journal of Semitic Studies, 7 (1962), 267-92.

Goulder, M. D., and Sanderson, W. L. "St. Luke's Genesis," Journal of Theological Studies, 8 (1957), 12-30.

Grelot, P. "L'interprétation catholique des livres saints," Introduction à la Bible. Edited by A. Robert and A. Feuillet, I (Tournai: Desclée, 1957),

_____. "Sagesse 10,21 et le Targum de l'Exode," Biblica, 42 (1961), 49-60.

_____. "Les Targums du Pentateuque--Étude comparative d'après Genèse iv, 3-16," Semitica, 9 (1959), 59-88.

_____. "Une Tosephta targoumique sur Genèse xxii dans un manuscrit liturgique de la Geniza du Caire," Revue des Études Juives, New Series, 16 (1957),

Griffitts, Donal, O.F.M. "The Literary Genus of the Matthean Infancy Narrative," Priestly Studies, 29 (1962), 30-65.

Guttmann, Michael. "Agada," Encyclopaedia Judaica, 1 (Berlin: Verlag Eschkol A.-G., 1928), cols. 951-72.

Heinemann, I. "The Development of the Technical Terms of Biblical Interpretation [Heb.]," Lešônênû, 14 (1946), 182-89.

Held, Moshe. "A Faithful Lover in an Old Babylonian Dialogue," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, 15 (1961), 1-26.

Heller, B. "Agadische Literatur," Encyclopaedia Judaica, 1 (Berlin: Verlag Eschkol A.-G., 1928), cols. 979-1036.

Holmes, Samuel. "The Wisdom of Solomon," The Apocrypha and Pseudpigrapha of the Old Testament. Edited by R. H. Charles (reprinted ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), I,

Horovitz, S. "Midrash," The Jewish Encyclopedia, 8 (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1904), 548-50.

Johnson, A. R. "Māšāl," Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, III; Leiden: Brill, 1955), pp. 162-69.

Kohler, K. "Wisdom," The Jewish Encyclopedia, 12 (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1907),

Lambert, G. "Le Manuel de Discipline de la grotte de Qumrân: étude historique et traduction intégrale," Nouvelle revue théologique, 73 (1951), 938-75.

Lane, W. R. "A New Commentary Structure in 4Q Florilegium," Journal of Biblical Literature, 78 (1959), 343-46.

_____. "Pesher Style as a Reconstruction Tool in 4Q Pesher Isaiah b," Revue de Qumrân, 2 (1960), 281-84.

Lauterbach, J. Z. "Midrash and Mishnah," Rabbinic Essays. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1951.

Le Deaut, R., C.S.Sp. "Traditions targumiques dans le Corpus Paulinien?" Biblica, 42 (1961), 28-48.

Lefèvre, A. "La Sagesse," Introduction à la Bible. Edited by A. Robert and A. Feuillet, I (Tournai: Desclée, 1957),

Lehmann, Manfred R. "1Q Genesis Apocryphon in the Light of the Targumim and Midrashim," Revue de Qumran, 1 (1958-59), 249-63.

Lesètre, H. "Midrasch," Dictionnaire de la Bible, 4 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1908), cols. 1077-80.

Lusseau, H. "Les livres des Chroniques," Introduction à la Bible, I (Tournai: Desclée, 1957), 722-23.

_____. "Les autres hagiographes," Introduction à la Bible, I (Tournai: Desclée, 1957), 692.

Margulies, E. [Heb. mrglywt!]. "The Term drš in Talmud and Midrash [Heb.]," Lešônênû, 20 (1956), 50-61.

Milik, J. T. "Fragments d'un midrash de Michée dans les manuscrits de Qumrân," Revue Biblique, 59 (1952), 412-18.

_____. "'Manuale disciplinae': Textus integri versio," Verbum Domini, 29 (1951), 129-58.

_____, et al. "Le travail d'édition des manuscrits de Qumrân," Revue Biblique, 63 (1956), 49-67.

Moore, George F. "Historical Literature," Encyclopaedia Biblica. Edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black. Vol. 2. New York: Macmillan, 1899.

Muñoz-Iglesias, S. "El Genero literario del Evangelio de la Infancia en San Mateo," Estudios Bíblicos, 17 (1958), 243-73.

Murphy, R. E. "Recent Literature on the Canticle of Canticles," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 16 (1954),

Perrot, Charles. "La Lecture synagogale d'Exode xxi, 1-xxii, 23 et son influence sur la littérature neo-testamentaire," A la rencontre de Dieu. Mémorial Albert Gelin (Le Puy: Editions Xavier Mappus, 1961), pp. 223-39.

Podechard, E. "Les références du Chroniqueur," Revue Biblique, 12 (1915), 236-47.

Rinaldi, G. "Alcuni termini ebraici relativi alla letteratura," Biblica, 40 (1959), 267-89.

Robert, A., p.s.s. "Les attaches littéraires bibliques de Prov I-IX," Revue Biblique, 43 (1934), 42-68; 172-204; 374-84; 44 (1935), 344-65; 502-25.

_____. "Le genre littéraire du Cantique des cantiques," Vivre et Penser, 3d series (1943-44), 192-213.

_____. "Les genres littéraires," Initiation Biblique, eds. A. Robert et A. Tricot (3d ed. rev.; Paris: Desclée, 1954), pp. 305-09.

_____. "Littéraires (genres)," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, 5 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1957), cols. 411-17.

Roth, Cecil. "The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis," Vetus Testamentum, 10 (1960),

Sandmel, Samuel. "The Haggada Within Scripture," Journal of Biblical Literature, 80 (1961), 105-22.

Sarfatti, G. "Notes on the Genesis Apocryphon," Tarbiz, 28 (1959), 254-59.

Schubert, Kurt. "Die jüdischen und judenchristlichen Sekten im Lichte des Handschriftenfundes von 'en Feŝcha," Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 74 (1952), 1-62.

Seeligmann, I. L. "Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegese," Congress Volume, Copenhagen ("Supplements to Vetus Testamentum"; vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 1953), pp. 150-81.

Siebeneck, Robert T., C.PP.S. "May Their Bones Return to Life! --Sirach's Praise of the Fathers," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 21 (1959), 411-28.

_____. "The Midrash of Wisdom 10-19," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 22 (1960), 176-82.

Silberman, Lou H. "A Note on 4Q Florilegium," Journal of Biblical Literature, 78 (1959), 158-59.

_____. "Unriddling the Riddle," Revue de Qumran, 3 (1961), 323-64.

Simonsen, D. "Ein Midrasch im IV. Buch Esra," Festschrift I. Lewy (Breslau, 1911), pp. 270ff.

Simpson, D. C. "The Book of Tobit," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Edited by R. H. Charles (reprinted ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), I, 187-94.

Skehan, Patrick W. "The Hand of Judith," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 25 (1963), 94-110.

_____. "The Text and Structure of the Book of Wisdom," Traditio, 3 (1945),

_____. "Two Books on Qumrân Studies," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 21 (1959), 71-78.

Sonne, Isaiah. "Remarks on 'Manual of Discipline' Col. vi, 6-7," Vetus Testamentum, 7 (1957), 405-08.

Spicq, C. "Nouvelles reflexions sur la théologie biblique," Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques, 42 (1958),

Spiro, A. "Samaritans, Tobiads, and Judahites in Pseudo-Philo," Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, 20 (1951),

Stein, S. "The Influence of Symposia Literature on the Literary Form of the Pesaḥ Haggadah," Journal of Jewish Studies, 8 (1957), 13-44.

Teicher, J. L. "The Dead Sea Scrolls--Documents of the Jewish-Christian Sect of Ebionites," Journal of Jewish Studies, 2 (1951), 76.

Theodor, J. "Midrash Haggadah," The Jewish Encyclopedia, 8 (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1904),

Torrey, C. C. "The Chronicler as Independent Narrator," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, 25 (1909), 157-73; 188-217.

van der Ploeg, J., O.P. "Le 'Manuel de Discipline' des rouleaux de la Mer Morte," Bibliotheca Orientalis, 8 (1951), 115-26.

_____. "Les manuscrits de Désert de Juda. Livres récents," Bibliotheca Orientalis, 16 (1959), 163.

_____. "Le rouleau d'Habacuc de la grotte de 'Ain Feshha," Bibliotheca Orientalis, 8 (1951), 2-11.

Vawter, Bruce, C.M. "Apocalyptic: Its Relation to Prophecy," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 22 (1960), 33-46.

Vermès, Géza. "Le 'Commentaire d'Habacuc' et le Nouveau Testament," Cahiers Sioniens, 5 (1951), 344-45.

_____. "A propos des commentaires bibliques découverts à Qumrân," La Bible et l'Orient (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955),

Vogt, Ernst. "Textumdeutungen im Buch Ezechiel," Sacra Pagina (Paris: Gabalda, 1959), I, 471-94.

von Soden, Wolfram. "Ein Zweigespräch Hammurabis mit einer Frau," Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, 49 (1950), 151-94.

Weingreen, J. "The Rabbinic Approach to the Study of the Old Testament," Bulletin of John Rylands Library, 34 (1951-52),

Wernberg-Møller, P. "Observations on the Interchange of Ayin and Het in the Manual of Discipline," Vetus Testamentum, 3 (1953), 104-07.

_____. "Some Reflections on the Biblical Material in the Manual of Discipline," Studia Theologica, 9 (1955),

Wieder, N. "The 'Law Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses," Journal of Jewish Studies, 4 (1953), 158-75.

Winter, P. "Notes on Wieder's Observations on the dwrš htwrh in the Book of the New Covenanters of Damascus," Jewish Quarterly Review, 45 (1954-55), 39-47.

Yadin, Y. "A Midrash on 2 Sam vii and Ps i-ii (4Q Florilegium)," Israel Exploration Journal, 9 (1959), 95-98.

Yalon, H. Review of M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls II, fasc. 2. Kirjath Sepher, 28 (1952), 64-74.

Zeitlin, Solomon. "Midrash: A Historical Study," Jewish Quarterly Review, 44 (1953), 21-36.